

THE
LANCASHIRE & YORKSHIRE ACCIDENT
INSURANCE COMPANY, LTD.

HEAD OFFICE: 30, BROWN STREET, MANCHESTER.

Established 1877.

Capital, £200,000.

This COMPANY'S GUARANTEE BONDS are accepted by
H.M. COURTS OF CHANCERY and BOARD OF TRADE, and by
all Departments of H.M. Government.

MORTGAGE and DEBENTURE INSURANCE.

The "CLIMAX" POLICY of the Company provides against
ACCIDENTS—ILLNESS—PERMANENT DISABLEMENT, &c.
Capital Sums Assured under the Policy are added to annually under a
CUMULATIVE BONUS SCHEME.

Policies are also issued indemnifying Employers in relation to the Work-
men's Compensation Acts, 1897-1900, the Employers' Liability Act, 1880,
and at Common Law, and Public Liability (Third Party) Risks.

R. KENNEDY MITCHELL, Manager and Secretary.

PHOENIX ASSURANCE CO., Ltd.

PHOENIX FIRE OFFICE.

ESTABLISHED 1782.

19, LOMBARD STREET, and 57, CHARING CROSS, LONDON.

Lowest Current Rates.

Liberal and Prompt Settlements.

Assured free of all Liability.

Electric Lighting Rules supplied.

X IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS X

In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of
LICENSED PROPERTY

To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of
LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to
THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND
GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Mortgages Guaranteed on Licensed Properties promptly, without
special valuation and at low rates.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE
SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

FUNDS	-	-	-	-	£4,700,000
INCOME	-	-	-	-	£610,000
YEARLY BUSINESS	-	-	-	-	£2,594,000
BUSINESS IN FORCE	-	-	-	-	£18,000,000

THE PERFECTED SYSTEM of Life Assurance is peculiar to this Society
and embraces every modern advantage.

PERFECTED MAXIMUM POLICIES.

WITHOUT PROFITS.

The Rates for these Whole Life Policies are very moderate.

Age	Premium	Age	Premium	Age	Premium
20	£1 7 8 %	30	£1 16 %	40	£2 10 %

£1,000 POLICY WITH BONUSES

According to last results.

Valuation at 2½ p.c. — Hm. Table of Mortality.

Duration	10 yrs.	20 yrs.	30 yrs.	40 yrs.
Amount of Policy	£1,199	£1,438	£1,794	£2,067

Full information on application to

THE MANAGER, 10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

VOL. L., No. 2.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 11, 1905.

* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and
copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on
the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must
be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	19	COLONIAL STOCKS ACT, 1903	29
DAMAGE BY SUBSIDENCE	22	LEGAL NEWS	30
THE NEW LAND REGISTRY BUILDING	23	COURT PAPERS	30
REVIEWS	24	WINDING-UP NOTICES	31
CORRESPONDENCE	25	CREDITORS' NOTICES	31
LAW SOCIETIES	25	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	32
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	25		

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Solicitors' Journal.

Adams v. Shaddock	25
George Murphy v. John William O'Donnell	25
Gilbey v. Rush	26
Hamshaw (Deceased), Re. Hamshaw and Another v. Stead and Another	27
Kirby and Another v. Barber	27
Marchioness of Huntly and Another v. Gaskell and Another	28
Morley and Another v. Bevington	27
Sir H. M. Stanley, Re. Tennant v. Stanley	26
Smalles & Son v. Hans Dressen & Co.	28

In the Weekly Reporter.

Brown v. Haig and Oxley	26
Davis v. Petrie	30
Fitzroy v. Cave	17
Hermann v. Charlesworth	22
Jones & Roberts, In re	22
Kee, In re. Ex parte Official Receiver	29
Lowe v. Dorting & Son	26
Northumberland (Duke) and Another v. Attorney-General	31

Current Topics.

The Birthday Legal Honours.

EVERY lawyer will rejoice to hear that Mr. ARTHUR COHEN, K.C., has been made a Privy Councillor—a somewhat tardy, but exceedingly fitting, recognition of his distinction as a lawyer and his public services in connection with the Alabama Arbitration and the recent Venezuela Arbitration. Mr. COHEN has been judge of the Cinque Ports for many years, and there are many who think that he would have adorned a much higher judicial post. The other promotions include Sir GEORGE HENRY LEWIS, Bart., solicitor, who has been appointed a Commander of the Royal Victorian Order.

Colonial Stocks as Trust Investments.

WE ASKED last week whether there had been any publication by the Treasury, in the *London Gazette* or otherwise, of a complete list of the Colonial Stocks available for trust investments, pursuant to the provision of section 2 of the Colonial Stock Act, 1900. The Paymaster of the Supreme Court has been good enough to send us a printed list of such stocks issued by the Treasury, brought up to date and including the recently authorized Newfoundland 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock, 1905. We confess we are rather surprised at the large number of these stocks which are authorized as trust investments.

The Land Registry.

OWING to the move of the Land Registry into the new building in Lincoln's-inn-fields, the offices at 33 and 34, Lincoln's-inn-fields will be closed on Saturday, the 18th inst., but the office at Clement's-inn will be open as usual for registrations, &c., in the South London district. On Saturday, the 25th inst., the offices in Lincoln's-inn-fields (including the new building) and in Clement's-inn will be closed.

Legal Encyclopaedias.

ENCYCLOPÆDIAS are a modern craze from which the realm of law has not been free. Opinions differ widely as to their practical utility. There is no doubt that their publication is a profitable occupation. Arrangements are already being made for another edition of the Encyclopaedia of the Laws of England, a work of which the final volume was issued only two years ago.

There is also an Encyclopædia of Scots Law, but Irish law has not been treated in the same way. Having regard to the scarcity of text-books and the difficulty that there is in ascertaining points of Irish law, it would seem that here exists an unoccupied field, which could be covered most suitably by an encyclopædia. Of course the Americans have produced an extensive work of this character. In thirty-six volumes are to be included the law and procedure of the United States. A French encyclopædia, which has just been completed in the same number of volumes, is perhaps the finest work of its kind. It was begun in 1887, and has been carried out under the direction of MM. CARPENTIER, FRÈREJOUAN DU SAINT and FUZIER-HERMANN. The editors have not placed a rigid interpretation upon the purpose of a law encyclopædia, but have covered a wide scope in the "Répertoire Général Alphabétique du Droit Français," which also includes colonial law. The Germans, although noted for their attention to work of this description, do not appear to have published any series of volumes closely corresponding to these encyclopædias of other countries.

Stamping Purchase Agreements.

IT WILL be seen from a letter which we print elsewhere that the opinion is held in some quarters that an agreement which is not stamped at the time of execution can be effectively stamped with an adhesive stamp within seven days, and that in this way the difficulty of stamping agreements for sale to which we referred last week can be got over. We fear, however, that there is a mistake in this. Section 8 of the Stamp Act, 1891, lays down the general rule that "an instrument, the duty upon which is required or permitted by law to be denoted by an adhesive stamp, is not to be deemed duly stamped with an adhesive stamp unless the person required by law to cancel the adhesive stamp cancels the same . . . or unless it is otherwise proved that the stamp appearing on the instrument was affixed thereto at the proper time." For the case of agreements section 22 adds the provision that the duty of sixpence "may be denoted by an adhesive stamp, which is to be cancelled by the person by whom the agreement is first executed." Hence the person who is "required by law" to cancel an adhesive stamp when used for an agreement is the person by whom the agreement is first executed, and it seems to follow from the express language of section 8 that, if he does not do so, the instrument is not to be deemed duly stamped with an adhesive stamp. All this we took to be well-known, and unless our correspondent can put a different construction upon these provisions, it is a little surprising that the simple way of checkmating the Somerset House authorities which he suggests has not come into general use. The recommendation of the Council of the Law Society to which our correspondent "A Country Solicitor" refers, that contracts should be stamped with an adhesive stamp on execution, is of course good enough as a piece of advice, but it ignores in too obvious a manner the real difficulty—namely, how to get them stamped when this precaution has been omitted.

The Rating of Places of Public Worship.

THE CONSTANT demands upon the purses of the rating authorities have compelled them to turn their attention to the increase of sources of supply. A general enforcement of the law respecting the rating of places of public worship is likely to create an interesting situation. Section 1 of the Poor Rates Exemption Act, 1833, provides that "No person or persons shall be rated, or shall be liable to be rated or to pay to any church or poor rates or cesses, for or in respect of any churches, district churches, chapels, meeting-houses, or premises, or such part thereof as shall be exclusively appropriated to public religious worship." Mr. RYDE (Rating, p. 110) comments on the ambiguity of the sentence, and submits that the words "exclusively appropriated to public religious worship" cannot be limited to "such parts thereof," but must apply to the whole of the preceding words. The Rating Exemptions (Scotland) Act, 1874 (37 & 38 Vict. c. 20), s. 1, contains a similar provision, which was considered in *Trustees of College-street United Free Church v. Parish Council of Edinburgh* (1901, 3 F. 414), when it was held that church and mission halls sometimes used for temperance meetings and for congregational social meetings

could not be regarded as exclusively appropriated to public religious worship and did not fall within the exemption. If action were taken upon this decision in England, a large number of mission buildings belonging to the Established Church and many more Nonconformist places of worship would have to pay rates. To the above quoted section of the Act of 1833 there is a proviso that no one shall derive any profit or advantage from the receipt of rents for any part of the buildings. But read in conjunction with the remainder of the clause, it would seem to provide "that if a chapel is exclusively appropriated to public religious worship, the receipt of pew rents does not destroy the exemption" (Ryde on Rating, p. 110). Seats sold at a musical festival in a cathedral, however, when a profit is made, would no doubt be held to place the building outside the exemption.

Life Assurance Funds.

THE PUBLIC inquiry into the management of a New York Assurance Company, which is now proceeding in the United States, is by no means without interest to Englishmen, who will read the reports of the testimony of the different officials with unfeigned astonishment. It cannot, of course, be maintained that the conduct of those in charge of English life assurance companies has always been beyond criticism, but among the instances of their irregularities which have been brought before the English courts we find nothing to compare with the extraordinary license which appears to prevail on the other side of the Atlantic. An injunction was once granted to restrain the directors of a life assurance company in England from issuing marine policies, and there are a few other cases where similar attempts to act beyond the powers of a company were promptly checked. But the enormous accumulations of the American life assurance company appear to have been spent for purposes in no way connected with the business for which they were destined at the time of their incorporation. It is suggested that one result of the inquiry will be that the State insurance laws will be altered so as to prevent such misapplication of their funds in future. But it is added that, so long as the practice of buying up trust companies, depositing insurance funds in them, and allowing those funds to be used for enterprizes in which the parent company itself could not embark, continues, it is doubtful whether any such reform will be effectual. We are not sure that we understand how a life assurance company is able to "buy up" a trust company. Does it mean that the surplus funds of the insurance company are invested in the purchase of a number of the shares of the trust company sufficient to ensure the control of it? It is the custom for our leading assurance companies to publish from time to time a list of their investments. Might this list include shares which had been purchased, not as an eligible investment, but solely for the purpose of obtaining control of the company to which they belonged, and using this company as a convenient screen in the execution of projects which were entirely *ultra vires*? We can hardly think that any such proceeding would be attempted by even the most presumptuous of the directors of our assurance companies.

Distress by Uncertificated Bailiff.

AN IMPORTANT question as to the effect of section 7 of the Law of Distress Amendment Act, 1888, has been given by the Divisional Court (Lord ALVERSTONE, C.J., and WILLS and DARLING, JJ.) in *Perring & Co. v. Emerson* (reported *ante*, p. 14). The section provides that "from and after the commencement of the Act no person shall act as a bailiff to levy any distress for rent unless he shall be authorized to act as a bailiff by a certificate in writing under the hand of a county court judge." Previously to the Act a landlord might distrain either in person or by any agent whom he might choose to employ, but, though he can apparently still distrain in person, he is limited in the selection of an agent, and must employ a duly certificated bailiff. In the above case, however, it was contended that section 7 applies only as between the landlord and the tenant, and that, as regards third persons, a distress made by an uncertificated agent is still valid. The question arose between a firm of furniture dealers, the plaintiffs, and the landlord, the defendant. The plaintiffs had supplied the tenant of a flat with furniture on the hire-purchase system, and, upon the instalments

being in
While t
not a c
and pu
the lan
and to
therefo
removes
distress
of the l
7 does
between
incident
the go
section
express
by the l
interest
to give
by the
bitten
the pla
distress

Peers

THE
the inte
House
to the
the Ho
we rec
do so t
lar case
court c
of Lon
questio
was di
"is w
practic
the Ho
he cou
House
"Let
four y
permis
from
in and
he has
the th
justice
O'Con
to the
court
body.
pages
in the
irrevoc
of O'C
Lord
the res
lay pe
Lord
the L
not he
tion a
two a
tion o

Lord

In
of Lo
delibe
of pr
case o
theor
practi

being in arrear, they proceeded to seize and remove the furniture. While this was being done an agent of the landlord, who was not a certificated bailiff, entered and stopped the removal, and purported to distrain the furniture on behalf of the landlord. Subsequently a certificated bailiff arrived and took possession of the furniture. The question, therefore, was whether the plaintiffs had effectually removed these goods so as to save them from the landlord's distress, and this depended on whether the original interference of the landlord's agent was lawful as against them. But section 7 does not appear to be in any way restricted to questions arising between the landlord and the tenant. One of the most important incidents of the law of distress is that the landlord can seize the goods of a third party to satisfy his own debt; and section 6, in regulating the time for replevying goods, refers expressly to "the tenant or owner." This, as was pointed out by the Lord Chief Justice, shews that the Act was passed in the interest of third persons as well as of tenants, and it is natural to give a corresponding effect to section 7. The act of seizure by the uncertificated bailiff, observed WILLIS, J., being forbidden in terms, could have no effect given to it, and the title of the plaintiffs, who had removed the goods before a lawful distress, remained.

Peers as Counsel.

THE CURRENT number of the Law Reports contains a report of the interesting discussion in the Committee of Privileges of the House of Lords in *Re Lord Kinross* (1905, A. C. 468) with respect to the right of a peer who is a barrister-at-law to practise before the House of Lords when sitting as a court of appeal, to which we recently referred. Theoretically, perhaps, he can no more do so than a judge can leave the bench and appear in a particular case as advocate. The House of Lords, when sitting as a court of appeal, is, or was, the same body as the House of Lords when sitting to discuss a Bill or to debate some question of foreign policy. And upon this footing Lord JAMES was disposed to treat the matter. "The question," he said, "is whether a man who is a member of a tribunal can practise before it"; and, if a peer was allowed to practise before the House when sitting as a court of appeal, he did not see how he could be prevented from practising before committees of the House, and before the House when sitting as a criminal court. "Let me," said Lord JAMES, "refer to a recent case. Three or four years ago we had a peer on his trial for a felony. If this permission is granted, what will there be to prevent a peer from being heard as an advocate at the bar, and then coming in and taking part in the decision of the very case in which he has been an advocate?" But the argument founded upon the theoretical nature of the House of Lords as a court of justice did not find favour, and it may be doubted whether since *O'Connell's case* (11 Cl. & F. 155) it can be said that, according to the theory of the constitution, the House of Lords as a court is identical with the House of Lords as a deliberative body. The constitution is capable of change, and the last two pages of the report in Clark and Finnely shew how this change in the position of the House of Lords as a court was quietly but irrevocably established. When the question as to the reversal of *O'CONNELL'S* conviction was first put, some lay peers voted. Lord LYNDRHURST, C., abstained from making any declaration of the result, and after a pause again put the question, when again lay peers voted. Thereupon a short discussion ensued, in which Lord BROUGHAM and Lord CAMPBELL took part, and at the end the Lord Chancellor said: "I think those noble lords, who have not heard the arguments, will decline voting if I put the question again." This was effectual. After another short speech or two all the lay lords withdrew, and the change in the constitution of the House of Lords as a court was complete.

Lord Kinross's Case.

IT MIGHT have been as well if the establishment of the House of Lords as a tribunal of appeal, distinct from the House as a deliberative assembly, had been followed by corresponding changes of procedure, and then the question involved in *Lord Kinross's case* could not have arisen. It has been decided, however, that theoretical considerations are not to interfere in this matter with practical convenience. Stress was naturally laid upon the case of

Lord COLERIDGE. "Lord COLERIDGE," said the Lord Chancellor, "who is a member of this House, is continually practising before the courts, and therefore it may be assumed that there is nothing in the position of an advocate before the courts to prevent a peer from practising at the bar." And if so, it would be absurd to let him practise in all the courts short of the highest, and then exclude him when his clients want his assistance on the final appeal. An analogy is also, as Lord HALSBURY pointed out, afforded by the position of a Privy Councillor who is not a member of the Judicial Committee, and he referred to the well-known example of Mr. ASQUITH. "It may be said that he is not a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. That is true; but it would be strange if that circumstance were to affect the question whether or not he ought to be heard as an advocate before the tribunal." Upon this example Lord JAMES observed that Mr. ASQUITH was the first Privy Councillor who had appeared before the Judicial Committee. In 1885, when he himself was made a Privy Councillor, he acted upon the rule then received, and refused to appear before the committee. But Mr. ASQUITH has broken through a pedantic restriction with impunity, and Lord JAMES ultimately withdrew his own view as to Lord KINROSS's position in deference to the clearly expressed opinion of the committee. Lord KINROSS is the son of the late Lord Justice General of Scotland, and is a practising barrister. A client desired to retain him in a case before the House of Lords, and hence the question was raised and referred to the Committee of Privileges. Lord ROBERTSON put the whole matter very shortly when he said: "No man is entitled to sit and take part in a decision in this House or anywhere else unless he has heard the cause, and heard it as a judge." This could not be said of Lord KINROSS or any other peer who was a practising barrister. Hence, since he could not be a member of the tribunal, he was at liberty to practise before it. In the result the Committee of Privileges, whose report was adopted by the House, decided that peers should be excluded from appearing before committees, and before the House when sitting under the presidency of the Lord High Steward on a criminal case, but otherwise it admitted their competency to practise as advocates before the House.

Rescission of Contract After Completion.

THE DECISION of JOYCE, J., in *Seddon v. North-Eastern Salt Co.* (53 W. R. 232; 1905, 1 Ch. 326) emphasizes the necessity of establishing fraud in a case where it is sought to rescind a completed contract. A purchase of shares in a company had been contracted for and carried into effect upon the faith of certain representations as to the losses which the company had sustained. Upon the accounts being subsequently examined by an accountant, it appeared that the losses had been very much understated, and the action was commenced for rescission of the contract and repayment of the purchase-money. There was, however, no allegation that the misrepresentation was fraudulent, and indeed the imputation of fraud was expressly disclaimed on behalf of the plaintiff. Under these circumstances the distinction between an executory and an executed contract, which was pointed out by Lord CAMPBELL in *Wilde v. Gibson* (1 H. L. C., p. 632), was applicable. With regard to an executory contract, if there is, in any way whatever, misrepresentation or concealment which is material to the purchaser, a court of equity will not compel him to complete the purchase; but where the conveyance has been executed, it will be set aside only upon the ground of actual fraud. And the distinction is obviously based upon sound principle. Upon entering into the contract the purchaser has not in general the means of verifying the representations made to him; and even if he has, yet the vendor, in seeking to enforce the contract, is applying for the assistance of a court of equity, and he is not entitled to that assistance if the contract has been induced by misrepresentation. But before completion the purchaser either satisfies himself as to the property or decides to take the risk of error, and after conveyance his remedy is confined to the single case of fraud, against which it is to be supposed he had no adequate means of protection. So in *Brownlie v. Campbell* (5 App. Cas., p. 936) Lord SELBORNE said that, when the conveyance has taken place, equity does not relieve against it unless there is a case of fraud or of misrepresentation amounting to fraud. Under the circum-

stances of *Seddon v. North-Eastern Salt Co.* (*supra*) this essential element of fraud did not exist, and upon that ground the claim made by the plaintiff failed. But JOYCE, J., also pointed out that, even if it had been well grounded originally, it must have failed on account of delay. The contract at most was not void, but only voidable, and should have been repudiated at the earliest possible moment. Against such a claim a very short delay is a bar, and the plaintiff, by remaining in possession of the shares for several months after he had had all necessary information, had debarred himself from any remedy.

Damage by Subsidence

THE recent case of *Tunncliffe & Hampson (Limited) v. West Leigh Colliery Co. (Limited)* (1905, 2 Ch. 390) raised an interesting question as to the measure of damages for injury due to subsidence caused by the working of mines, but the decision could hardly be doubtful, having regard to the rule established by the leading case of *Darley Main Colliery Co. v. Mitchell* (11 App. Cas. 127). In *Tunncliffe & Hampson v. West Leigh Colliery Co.* the action was brought in December, 1903, to recover damages for injury to the plaintiffs' mills by subsidence owing to the removal of minerals by the defendant company. The working of the mines in the neighbourhood of the mills had ceased, and therefore there was an end of the acts originally causing the subsidence; but under such circumstances the removal of the original cause does not prevent the recurrence of subsidence from time to time, and the recurrence, therefore, of damage to the surface property. In the present case the defendants admitted liability, and judgment was taken by consent directing an inquiry as to the damages to which the plaintiffs were entitled. The inquiry was held before an official referee, and he assessed the damages down to the date of the judgment under two heads: first, he allowed £1,300 for the cost of repairs to the premises which required to be immediately done; and next, he allowed £13,200 as damages for depreciation of the premises, being 15 per cent. on the sum of £88,000, at which he valued the property, including the land, buildings, and fixed and moveable machinery previous to the subsidence. In giving judgment, the official referee treated the depreciation as the difference in market value of the premises before and after the damage, and he estimated it on the basis of what a purchaser would give if the plaintiffs wanted to sell. He did not profess to give compensation for possible future damage, at least not directly. But he admitted that the possibility of future damage would interfere with the price to be given by a possible purchaser, and the consequent depreciation of price he regarded as present damage. The defendant company took objection to the report upon the ground that the official referee, in thus allowing for the effect of the possibility of future damage as an element in present depreciation of value, had, in point of fact, included damages for future injury by subsidence, and had thus violated the principle established by *Darley Main Colliery Co. v. Mitchell*.

This principle, as is well known, depends upon the nature of the cause of action in such cases, and it has been established that the mere working of the mines, though followed by subsidence, is not in itself wrongful, and therefore gives no cause of action. The action is one of the class in which damage is an essential feature—is the "gist of the action"—and there is no cause of action unless and until the subsidence causes damage. This was settled by *Backhouse v. Bonomi* (9 H. L. C. 503), in which the House of Lords affirmed the decision of the Exchequer Chamber. "The question," said WILLES, J., in the latter tribunal (E. B. & E. 654), "depends upon what is the character of the right—namely, whether the support must be afforded by the neighbouring soil itself, or such a portion of it as would be, beyond all question, sufficient for present and future support; or whether it is competent to the owner to abstract the minerals without liability to an action, unless and until actual damage be thereby caused to his neighbour." When the case came before the House of Lords the judges, who were consulted, unanimously took the latter view, and it was adopted by the House, consisting of Lord WESTBURY, C., and Lords BROUGHAM, CRANWORTH, WENSLEYDALE,

and CHELMSFORD. "I think it is abundantly clear," said the Lord Chancellor, "both upon principle and upon authority, that when the enjoyment of the house is interfered with by the actual occurrence of the mischief, the cause of action then arises, and that the action may then be maintained." And Lord CRANWORTH pointed out that the right of the owner of the surface land was not a right to the pillars or support. "In truth his right is a right to the ordinary enjoyment of his land, and till that ordinary enjoyment is interfered with he has nothing of which to complain." Consequently it was held in that case that the Statute of Limitations ran against the right to recover damages for injury by subsidence from the time when the damage arose, and not from the time when the working which caused the damage took place.

But there is a further question whether, when damage has occurred, this finally fixes the cause of action so that damages must be recovered at once both for injury actually suffered and for possible future injury; or whether, with each fresh subsidence, there accrues a new cause of action in which damages for the further injury can be recovered. This is the question which came before the House of Lords in *Darley Main Colliery Co. v. Mitchell* (*supra*), and that tribunal held that a new cause of action arose with each successive suffering of injury. "Since the decision of this House," said Lord HALSBURY, "in *Backhouse v. Bonomi*, it is clear that no action would lie for the excavation. It is not, therefore, a cause of action; that case established that it is the damage, and not the excavation, which is the cause of action. I cannot understand why every new subsidence, although proceeding from the same original act or omission of the defendants, is not a new cause of action for which damages may be recovered."

It follows from this view of the liability of the mine owner to a fresh action when further subsidences cause new damage, that the possibility of such further damage cannot be included in the damages given in an action based upon damage already accrued; and if this cannot be done directly it seems that it cannot be done indirectly. In the present case of *Tunncliffe & Hampson v. West Leigh Colliery Co.* (*supra*), the official referee had in effect given damages for future injury when he treated the depreciation in value of the premises, for the purposes of sale, as the test of the present damage, and included in such depreciation the possibility of future injury. Upon the authorities this was wrong. "The law is," said SWINFEN EADY, J., "that in the case of colliery working, where the mine owner is lawfully working his own minerals, damages cannot be recovered for future apprehended injury, whether there is or is not any existing actual damage. It follows, in my opinion, that the surface owner cannot recover any depreciation or diminution in the present selling value of his property caused by the apprehension of future damage. If he is not entitled to recover any sum for the risk of future damage, why should the amount be recoverable because a purchaser will only give so much less for the property on that account? Present depreciation caused by the risk of future injury is not, in my judgment, recoverable in cases like the present, any more than the future damage itself." Consequently, the learned judge decided that, since the official referee had included the risk of future injury in his report, the matter must go back to him for reconsideration.

But while this result seems to follow naturally from the principle established by *Darley Main Colliery Co. v. Mitchell* (*supra*), it cannot be denied that the risk of future injury may have a very prejudicial effect upon the property. Theoretically, the surface owner and purchasers from him are protected by the right to bring a fresh action when the new injury arises, but apart from the objection of purchasers to take over the prospect of a law-suit, it may well be that, by the time the new injury occurs, there is no person who is liable to the action. This is illustrated by *Greenwell v. Low Beechburn Coal Co.* (1897, 2 Q. B. 165), where it was held that, where the original mine owner whose working had caused the subsidence had parted with the mines before the further injury occurred, the owners at the time of the injury were not liable. Such owners are not bound to provide against the results of the predecessors' working, and against them the fresh injury gives no cause of action. But, on the other hand, the right of action against the original mine owner, which is thus the only remedy available, may be lost by

the death
own per
mine own
owner h
The fact
law allow
for such
excluded
establish
Statute
action
from tim
having
working
future ac
change
referee c
diate con
purchases
attendant
EADY, J.
confining
any furth

The

THE build
which is
action of
approach
staff—the
street, an
able to re
inst.; wh
to look a
quarters
workmen
of wire fo
on doors,
ing to a
get so fa
gone" ac
erection i
offices so
inn-fields
it reaches
the remo
pulled do
offices wil
comprises
wing, cor
The arc
Works, w
buildings
deal of w
the new I
stone, the
ment and
fine aspect
look upon
front is th
height th
towers at
will doub
to be bui
fashion, a
centre of
and projec
walls. Th
tonous ap
bordered
floor. Do
these spr
carving, a
Registry"
gold, sepe
pillars sur
the back
end door—
—is very
architect

the death of the mine owner. The maxim *actio personalis moritur cum persona* applies, and unless the injury is suffered while the mine owner, whose excavations caused it, is living, the surface owner has no remedy: *Hall v. Duke of Norfolk* (48 W. R. 565). The fact, however, that the remedy for future injury which the law allows may be ineffective is not a reason for giving damages for such injury in an action from which they are upon principle excluded. The surface owner has his advantage under the rule established by the House of Lords cases in regard to the Statute of Limitations. He is not bound to bring his action until the damage is suffered, and he can sue from time to time with each fresh damage without risk of having his claim barred by lapse of time since the original working. Against this he must put the possibility that these future actions may sometimes be ineffectual owing to death or change of ownership. This disadvantage the report of the referee counterbalanced by allowing the surface owner immediate compensation for depreciation in selling value, since the purchaser would, of course, take into account all the risks attendant upon prospective injury. The judgment of SWINFEN EDY, J., follows the principle established by the authorities in confining the damages to the injury actually suffered, leaving any further injury to be compensated as it arises.

The New Land Registry Building.

THE building at the corner of Lincoln's-inn-fields and Serle-street, which is to provide, so far as it has gone, the offices for the transaction of business in connection with land registration, is rapidly approaching completion; so rapidly indeed that a portion of the staff—that which has had its location in the old building in Portugal-street, and which deals with property north of the Thames—will be able to remove into the new premises about next Saturday, the 18th inst.; while the remainder, at Clement's-inn, whose function it is to look after that on the south side of the river, will change their quarters within a week afterwards; that is to say, if the army of workmen who are at the time of writing engaged in fixing up miles of wire for the electric lighting, rearing partitions, painting legends on doors, carrying in huge chests of big shallow drawers, and attending to a thousand and one other operations, will have been able to get so far forward as to allow thereof. We say "so far as it has gone" advisedly, for it must be borne in mind that the present erection is only one-half of the structure which is to be built. The offices so far occupy the block at the south-east corner of Lincoln's-inn-fields which runs round Serle-street and Portugal-street until it reaches the old buildings of the Middlesex Registry. As soon as the removal of the staff is completed, these old buildings will be pulled down and the site cleared, when the erection of the new offices will be carried on to completion. The present new Registry comprises the east wing and the central entrance, whilst the west wing, corresponding with that at the east, has yet to be erected.

The architect, Sir HENRY TANNER, F.R.I.B.A., of the Office of Works, who, by the way, is the architect of the new Post Office buildings on the site of Christ's Hospital, and has designed a good deal of work for the Post Office, has selected the Jacobean style for the new Registry, using for his materials red brick and Portland stone, the latter being employed for the windows and the basement and for the dressings generally. The principal front has a fine aspect towards Lincoln's-inn-fields, and the two other elevations look upon fairly wide thoroughfares. The dominant feature of the front is the central block, which rises over the entrance to a greater height than any other part of the building, not excepting the towers at the Serle-street and Portugal-street angles, which towers will doubtless be repeated at the other angles on the west end yet to be built. The windows in this central block are of the bow fashion, as is the case with those beneath the angle towers and the centre of the Serle-street façade; otherwise the windows are flat, and project but little beyond the rest, or brickwork portions of the walls. This, to our thinking, gives the building a somewhat monotonous appearance, which is but little relieved by the shields bordered with florid scroll-work over each window on the first floor. Double Ionic pillars flank the central doorway, and from these springs a circular arch, its spandrels filled with elaborate carving, and above is a panel in stone with the words "Land Registry" carved upon it. Gates of wrought iron, relieved with gold, separate the forecourt from Lincoln's-inn-fields, their stone pillars surmounted by lions holding shields. Portugal-street, as the back of the building, has the plainest elevation, and even its end door—which will, of course, be the central entrance eventually—is very much less elaborate than that in Lincoln's-inn-fields. The architect has designed a circular headed doorway without pillars,

and has been content, so far as ornament is concerned, with little more than a panel bearing the legend "Land Registry" over the entrance, with one of his favourite shields on either side. This will probably be the entrance generally used by the public, as it is close to the passenger lift and to the west or, ultimately, central staircase, which leads up to every floor as well as down into the basement. There is no staircase from the principal entrance in Lincoln's-inn-fields, the nearest on that side being at the Serle-street angle of the building. The railings which surround the Registry are of good design, and on the Lincoln's-inn front they are broken by square columns of red brick and stone, crowned with pyramidal pinnacles. The five floors above the basement give the building size and dignity, and the many gables which arise on every side make a by no means unpleasant sky line.

Entering by the back, or Portugal-street, doorway, a flight of half-a-dozen steps leads through outer and inner oaken doors to the level of the ground floor, past the usual small room for the attendants who will guard the entrance and direct the members of the public using the Registry to the particular room or rooms where their business is to be transacted. Opposite the entrance is a staircase to the upper and lower parts of the building, flanked on one side by the passenger lift, and on the other by that for coal, luggage, etc. On this floor all the work of registration will be carried out. The rooms will accordingly be occupied by the clerks who take in registrations. On the front facing Lincoln's-inn-fields on this floor is a large room fitted with a long counter going round three of its sides, where the identification of land sites by the public will take place, and here they will meet for the identification of their properties when registered, this room being devoted exclusively to properties on the north side of the Thames. The room runs the whole length of the building as far as the central entrance and the main hall leading from it. Facing the room, on the other side of the corridor, is an alcove for the accommodation of the public while they are waiting to be attended to, and benches are to be placed here for their comfort meanwhile.

The main hall is a handsome and picturesque apartment, reached by steps from Lincoln's-inn-fields, with its plaster panelled ceiling and its flight of marble steps, leading to the higher level of the ground floor through an oaken balustrade by an archway supported by double columns of variegated marble. Other columns rise at intervals from the oaken panelling, and an electrolier of light and graceful design—a cluster of nine incandescent lamps depending from the centre of the ceiling—gives ample illumination. The electric lamps, it may be stated, are throughout the building, wherever it has been thought desirable to introduce ornament, of very excellent design; and the same remark applies to the iron-work, the brass or bronze door handles and plates, and so on, and to the chimney-pieces, which are, in the better rooms, of oak, and in others painted white, aesthetic green tiles surrounding the numerous slow combustion stoves. Opposite the main hall, and close to the identification room, is the room in which stamps and forms may be obtained, so that the public will not have far to go for these necessary appurtenances of the work.

At the Serle-street and Portugal-street corner is a second staircase, but as this is unprovided with a lift, and is not nearly as accessible as that at the Portugal-street, the principal entrance practically, it is likely to be far less used than the other.

On the first floor the principal, and by far the largest, room is intended for the identification of land south of the Thames. This again is a fine room, extending, with the two clerks' rooms at either end, the whole length of the Serle-street side of the building. Upon this floor is also a large room entirely devoted to the storage of the registers, which is to be filled with bookcases containing the registers, and this is the room in which the public will make searches. A lift, worked by electricity, has been installed in the room in order that books and papers may be readily obtained from various other parts of the building, and to guard against disaster from any accident, a supplemental lift is provided which will be operated by hand. Doors lead from the public room to smaller rooms, which will be occupied by the clerks engaged in work connected directly with the registers, with the object that the registers should not be carried about more than is necessary, and that they may be always practically on the spot. Hitherto the arrangements in this respect have been very defective, as the old building was altogether unfitted for the work of the Registry, adapted as it was from private buildings and the old Official Referees' Courts. The rooms on the Lincoln's-inn side on this floor will be set apart for the use of the registrar, the assistant registrar, the secretary, and other principal officials, who will have the clerks closely connected with the register, and who write their letters, and so on, on the same floor as themselves. The registrar's room, as of right, is the more generously fitted; its two fire-places are somewhat elaborately carved in oak, with pillars and other adornments, and the walls are panelled in the same wood.

The central office on the second floor runs the whole length of the south, or Portugal-street side, and is similar in size and plan to that in which the registers are kept. Here a great deal of the clerical work is to be done, all the papers coming through this room before they are sent on from one to another, and here, it may be said, the work of the office is regulated. In so extensive an office as the Land Registry, papers may be at the typist's, or being checked or settled, and in the ordinary way one could never tell at once where they would be likely to be at a particular moment, but in this room the necessary information will readily be obtainable. The clerks here will keep diaries in which the particulars of every transaction are entered, so that the papers connected with it can at once be traced. On this floor, which is wholly used by the clerical staff, are placed the lavatories for the staff, which, as between 270 and 280 people are employed, it may be imagined are extensive and commodious. It is thought that it will not be found necessary to increase the present staff unless a larger area than the County of London is brought under the Act. The remainder of the floor will be occupied by the map department. One of the largest branches of the work of the Registry is the preparation of plans, and the staff required for the work will of necessity occupy a very considerable space.

The third floor will be wholly occupied by the map department, naturally a very large branch of the work, and here the triplicate copies of plans, which is an essential feature of the registry, will be made.

On the fourth floor the land charges department will be accommodated. The public will use the large room facing Lincoln's-inn-fields for the purpose of searching the registers. On this floor also the attendants or messengers will have rooms specially set apart for their use. Amongst these is a commodious mess room, where the men may take their meals—that is, such food as they may bring into the building for themselves, for there are to be no kitchens and no catering for the clerks or the other members of the staff, and the remainder of the rooms on this floor will be occupied by various clerks.

There is yet another room a floor higher of considerable dimensions. This is the room already mentioned as hidden away behind the gable over the principal entrance, and which cannot be seen from the outside. It has not yet been appropriated, but it can be turned to use either for the clerical staff, or for storage, in both of which respects the demands, of course, will be very exacting.

There are two floors below the ground floor—namely, the sub-ground floor and the basement. On the first accommodation will be provided for the scrivener department, where most of the writing work will be carried out. The work connected with provincial registration—that is to say, that concerned with property outside the County of London—the provincial department as it is called as distinct from that which is compulsory under the Act—will be conducted on this floor. Some thousands of properties, we are informed, all over the country have been registered voluntarily in the office, and the space beneath the forecourt in Lincoln's-inn-fields has been utilised for storing the old Middlesex memorials under the Middlesex Registration of Deeds Act. This floor also gives access across the area which runs around the building, to the coal-cellars which, to the number of twenty-two, extend along the Serle-street and Portugal-street sides beneath the public footways, and will eventually be continued round the west and south sides of the structure yet to be erected. It will be seen that the provision in this respect is by no means niggardly; but the building is very effectually, not to say lavishly, heated. Hot water pipes extend their ramifications all over the various floors, as is apparent by the clusters of piping in evidence in every corner and at various places in the corridors, and, in addition, each room has its one fireplace at least, and many of them have two. Doubtless, however, a building of this description needs to be kept well warmed to guard against the devastations which might be effected by moth and mildew.

In the basement below are two big strong rooms where will be kept the copies of the deeds in triplicate which are made in the office, and extensive nests of shelves are being erected for their accommodation. Other rooms here are to be devoted to the storage of papers, where they may be considered to be practically safe against fire; for although the two strong rooms give additional security, the whole of the building has been planned and constructed on the most up-to-date fireproof principles. The court or well which runs up through the building has been turned to good purpose here, and, roofed in with glass, it affords a fine room with capital light for the examination of papers brought from the neighbouring storage rooms. The bookbindery for dealing with the registers will also be placed on this floor. This is naturally a very considerable department of the registry. And, of course, space is found in the basement for the boilers which heat the warming apparatus, the engines which furnish electricity for lighting and for operating the lifts, and the hundred and one other necessities

inseparable from so large a structure. Some notion of the number of rooms may be obtained from the fact that the numbers painted on the doors run up to 17, 18, and 19 on each floor, as the case may be, and though a few of the rooms have two, or in one or two instances three entrances, one may gather that a building with so large a staff must be of very considerable extent.

A noticeable feature of the Registry is the excellent lighting, as may be imagined from the number and size of the windows as viewed from the exterior, a feature which the style of architecture particularly favours. On the side facing Lincoln's-inn-fields there is, of course, a clear unobstructed look out, and the other two sides of the building give on open thoroughfares, whilst a spacious central well, or court, lined with glazed white bricks on every hand effectively lights the rooms which face inwards. The court will be repeated in the west wing, so that if a sufficient space is left on the further side, there will be nothing to complain of in this respect. At present the central part, at all events so far as the lower floors are concerned, is somewhat dark and gloomy, as it adjoins closely the bare and broken walls left from the buildings which have been pulled down to make room for the Registry.

Reviews.

The Intermediate Examination

THE INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION DIGEST: CONTAINING ALL THE QUESTIONS SET AT THE INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS OF THE LAW SOCIETY ON STEPHEN'S COMMENTARIES ON THE LAWS OF ENGLAND, WITH EXTRA QUESTIONS ON BOOK IV.; AND INTENDED AS A REVISION GUIDE TO THAT WORK. FIFTH EDITION. By the AUTHORS (ALBERT GIBSON and ARTHUR WELDON) and H. GIBSON RIVINGTON, M.A. The "Law Notes" Publishing Offices.

This work continues to give the student the advantage of being able to test his knowledge by recourse to the questions which have been set in the Intermediate Examination, and the editors have incorporated the questions set since the last edition appeared—namely, from Hilary, 1901, to Trinity, 1905, inclusive. This would mean a considerable increase in the size of the book, but something is gained by the avoidance of duplicate questions, and by the elimination of questions which the alterations in the later edition of Stephen's Commentaries have rendered obsolete. Apart from this, it appears, the present edition contains all the questions set from the time when "Stephen" was first adopted as the subject for the Intermediate Examination, and, moreover, hypothetical questions have been added on the recently included Book IV., which has not yet furnished a sufficient supply of actual questions. We may suggest that hypothetical questions are quite good enough for the purpose, and at any rate the student will be glad of the additional help. The answers to the questions are clearly and fully expressed, and the student who chooses to test himself by this book should feel confident about his examination.

Belgian Law.

A TREATISE ON BELGIAN LAW: CONTAINING A COMPLETE TRANSLATION OF THE ENTIRE CODE OF COMMERCE AND CODE OF PROCEDURE; EXTRACTS FROM THE CIVIL CODE ON THE SUBJECTS OF INHERITANCE, SUCCESSION, MARRIAGE CONTRACTS, DIVORCE AND JUDICIAL SEPARATION; A TRANSLATION OF SEPARATE LAWS RELATING TO PATENTS, LETTRES DE MER (NAVIGATION CERTIFICATES), AND COMPOSITIONS TO AVOID INSOLVENCY; AND A VOCABULARY OF PHRASES AND WORDS USED IN THE CODES AND LAWS WHICH HAVE A TECHNICAL MEANING. By ERNEST TODD, Barrister-at-Law. Butterworth & Co.

Every lawyer knows the difficulty in which he is often placed through not having at hand the means of ascertaining the law of foreign countries. In general it is necessary to have recourse to a lawyer familiar with the particular system, but this would be often unnecessary if a statement of the foreign law were available, especially when the point depends upon a code, or upon the words of a particular statute. This assistance Mr. Ernest Todd gives with regard to the most useful part of Belgian law. The book opens with a commentary on the several branches of the law—on Inheritance and Succession (Chap. VIII.), for instance, and on Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Chap. XVI.), and Commercial Companies (Chap. XVII.). It is interesting to compare the provisions as to partnerships and limited companies with those which prevail here. And the chapter on the Mercantile Marine (Chap. XIX.) should prove of great value. There then follow translations of the Code of Civil Procedure, the Commercial Code, and various special laws, with a vocabulary of technical phrases. The book will be a very useful addition to the

Nov

library
and we h
other covA Com
Barrister
M.A.,
Barrister
Sweet &Sir,—
Current
know, m
frequent
clause p
May, 18
stamp, w
(if they
that a s
within a
put in e
the prop
I quite
it best t
Nov.

[See

Sir,—
and to
subject
instance
reply st
suggesi
upon th
(the Cou
provinci
of the C
The a
ties is th
theoretic
I fear
of igno
to the
increase
solicitor
Nov.At Un
Roman—
which p
for the
generall
attached
deed bel
through
to the o
the ow
property
money
registrat
register
title-dee
wished
before th
the nam
The old
one of th
The reg
see at a
every p
valid ag
and on
duty up
inasmuch
collected
cost of p

library of lawyers whose clients are concerned in Belgian business, and we hope it may be the forerunner of similar works relating to other countries.

Books of the Week.

A Compendium of Mercantile Law. By JOHN WILLIAM SMITH, Barrister-at-Law. Eleventh Edition. By EDWARD LOUIS DE HART, M.A., LL.B. (Cantab.), and RALPH ILIFF SIMEY, B.A. (Oxon.), Barristers-at-Law. In Two Vols. Stevens & Sons (Limited); Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

Correspondence.

The Stamping of Purchase Agreements.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I have read the letter from "W. & H." and your article in Current Topics on this subject. The clause referred to is, as you know, more usually contained in conditions of sale by auction. I frequently have contracts brought to me by clients, and if I find a clause prohibiting requisitions as to the stamping of documents before May, 1888, I make it a practice to at once affix a sixpenny adhesive stamp, which, I submit, is sufficient. I venture to say that "W. & H." (if they will allow me to say so) have thrown away £10. I contend that a sixpenny adhesive stamp is sufficient so long as it is affixed within seven days. If a contract bearing such a stamp had to be put in evidence, I submit that it would be upheld, as it would bear the proper duty.

I quite agree with "W. & H.'s" general remarks, but I have thought it best to mention my views. X. Y. Z.

Nov. 4.
[See observations under head of "Current Topics."—Ed. S.J.]

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—It may be of interest to your correspondents "W. & H.," and to solicitors generally, to know that as lately as June last this subject was brought before the Council of the Law Society at the instance of one of the provincial societies, and that the Council in reply stated that, so far as they were aware, the adoption of their suggestion that these contracts should have an adhesive stamp placed upon them before signature had removed the difficulty, and that they (the Council) did not think it necessary to re-open the matter. The provincial society expressed their surprise and regret at this decision of the Council.

The arbitrary and absurd attitude of the Somerset House authorities is therefore allowed to remain unquestioned by the society which theoretically represents the solicitors of the United Kingdom.

I fear that, so long as the Council continue in their present practice of ignoring, and refusing to interfere in, matters of practical utility to the profession, the appeals which are continually made for an increase in the membership of the society will, so far as provincial solicitors are concerned, meet with very scant success.

Nov. 7.

A COUNTRY SOLICITOR.

At University College, on Thursday, in continuation of his lectures on Roman-Dutch law, says the *Times*, Mr. Mackarness dealt with the system which prevailed in the Cape and other colonies where that law was in force for the acquisition, alienation, and incumbrance of land. A man's title generally originated in a grant from the Government, with diagram attached, which was issued in duplicate by the surveyor-general, one title-deed being filed by the latter in his office and the other, after passing through the hands of the registrar of deeds for registration, being issued to the owner. Registration consisted in the insertion by the registrar of the owner's name in one volume of the land register and of the property fully described in another. If a man desired to raise money on his property he produced his title-deeds before the registrar and also a duly executed mortgage bond. The bond was registered in the debt registry and recorded in the land register, the title-deeds being indorsed with notice of the mortgage. If the owner wished to sell his land, he executed in duplicate a simple transfer deed before the registrar, who signed it, and amended the register by inserting the name of the purchaser as the new owner and the fact of the transfer. The old title-deeds were surrendered by the vendor, and were handed with one of the new transfer deeds to the purchaser and formed his title-deeds. The registers were open to the inspection of the public, who could thus see at a glance the whole history of the alienation and incumbrance of every property. No title-deeds and no transfer or mortgage of land were valid against third parties unless they were recorded in the deeds registry and on the title-deeds of the parties affected. In all the colonies a small duty upon every transfer was levied, and proved a most efficient tax, inasmuch as it brought in a large revenue to the public exchequer collected at a trifling cost. The legal expenses were little more than the cost of preparation of a simple transfer deed.

Cases of the Week.

Court of Appeal.

ADAMS v. SHADDOCK. No. 1. 1st. Nov.

MASTER AND SERVANT—EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY—ACCIDENT—COMPENSATION—ENGINEERING WORK—TRAMWAY, ALTERATION OF—WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1897 (60 & 61 VICT. c. 37), s. 7

Appeal from an award of Judge. Luah-Wilson, K.C., under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, sitting at the Plymouth County Court. The applicant was the widow of a deceased workman who was in the employment of a contractor. The employer had entered into a contract with a telephone company, which had statutory powers to carry telephone wires under the streets, to carry a wire across and under a certain street at Devonport. There were two lines of tramway along the street, one up and the other down. The contractor's workmen dug a trench in the street from one side up to within about two feet of the down tramway line, and also a trench between the up and down tramway lines, and it was proposed to make another trench on the far side of the up line to the other side of the street. The trenches on each side of the tramway lines were to be connected with the trench in the space between the up and down lines by means of a hole under the tramway lines through which the wire was to be passed. The deceased workman was employed upon this work, and while engaged in making a hole with an iron bar under the down tramway line from the trench outside the rails to the trench between the up and down lines, he was killed by a passing tramcar. The working of the tramway was not stopped or interfered with by the work. The applicant claimed compensation upon the ground that the deceased man was at the time of the accident employed "on or in or about engineering work"—namely, the alteration of a "railroad" (which includes a tramway: *Fletcher v. London United Tramways Co.*, 50 W. R. 597; 1902, 2 K. B. 269) within the meaning of section 7, sub-section 2, of the Act of 1897. The county court judge held that the employer was not liable upon the ground that the work was not an alteration of the tramway. Putting it at its highest it could only be described as an interference with or alteration of the soil on which the rails rested. The property of the tramway company was not in any way altered by reason of the work. He therefore made an award in favour of the employer. The applicant appealed.

THE COURT (COLLINS, M.R., and MATHEW, L.J., ROMER, L.J., dissenting) allowed the appeal.

COLLINS M.R., said that he had formed his opinion with hesitation and he felt a difficulty upon the point. The work upon which the deceased man was employed at the time of the accident undoubtedly involved an alteration of the physical condition of the surface of the roadway between the up and down tramway lines. By whomsoever the workman was employed, if he was employed on or about the alteration of a tramway, the Act applied. His lordship came to the conclusion that the alteration of the road between the up and down lines was an alteration of the tramway within the definition of engineering work in section 7, sub-section 2, of the Act. It seemed to him that the space between the rails would be included in the tramway for the purposes of the Act. That being so, the Act applied.

ROMER, L.J., dissented. He did not see how they could properly differ from the finding of the county court judge. It could not be said that, because a tramway was laid upon a public road, the whole of the road became part of the tramway. Nor would the fact that, under section 28 of the Tramways Act, 1870, the tramway company were bound to repair that part of the road between the up and down lines make that part of road so much part of the tramway that any alteration in it would, as a matter of law, be an alteration of the tramway. In his opinion, reading the words of the Act in their fair and common sense meaning, the digging of the trench between the up and down lines could not be called an alteration of the tramway. The tramway was not, and was not intended to be, affected or altered. In his opinion the county court judge's decision was right, and in any case they could not interfere with his finding upon a question of fact, as to whether this was an "alteration" of the tramway, where there was ample evidence to support his decision.

MATHEW, L.J., agreed with the Master of the Rolls. In his opinion the making of the trench between the up and down lines was an alteration of the tramway. The whole work, too, involved an interference with and an alteration of the soil and ballast upon which the tramway lines rested. If the trench was being filled in when the accident happened, in his opinion that would have been a repair of the tramway.—COUNSEL, *John Sankey; W. Shakespeare*. SOLICITORS, *H. Dobell*, for J. F. Dobell, Plymouth; *William Hurd & Son*, for Bond & Pearce, Plymouth.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

GEORGE MURPHY v. JOHN WILLIAM O'DONNELL. No. 1. 3rd Nov.

MASTER AND SERVANT—EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY—ENGINEERING WORK—CONSTRUCTION—MECHANICAL POWER—WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (60 & 61 VICT. c. 37), s. 7, SUB-SECTION 2.

Appeal from the decision of the judge of the County Court of Leeds. The appellant, John William O'Donnell, had contracted with Messrs. Stocks to supply them with a machine to be delivered and erected on the third floor of Messrs. Stocks' premises. The machine would be worked by steam. It was delivered in parts in packing cases at the said premises, and the heavier parts were hoisted up by pulleys to the third floor where the machine was to be erected, whilst the smaller parts were taken up by the lift worked by mechanical power. No mechanical power was required

to erect the machine *in situ*. The respondent, George Murphy, who was in the employ of the appellant, was a skilled mechanic and had charge of the work. Whilst he was putting into position some of the parts of the machine on the third floor by means of pulleys, one of the parts slipped and he was injured, necessitating in the result the amputation of his foot. The county court judge found that he was engaged in engineering work within the meaning of the definition in section 7, sub-section 2, of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, and was entitled to compensation. The definition is "engineering work" shall include . . . "any other work for the construction, alteration, or repair of which machinery driven by steam, water, or other mechanical power is used." Counsel for the appellant argued that the construction of the machine must be the erection of it, and for that no mechanical power was required. It was impossible to say that the delivery of the parts to the third floor, for which alone mechanical power was used, could form any part of the construction. If no mechanical power was used in the construction, the work would not come within the definition. Counsel for the respondent argued that the whole work was inseparable. In common parlance it would all be called engineering work. In *Cogrove v. Partington* (17 T. L. R. 39) the contract was to put a new storey on a mill which involved the hoisting up of iron girders, resulting in injury to a workman who was held entitled to compensation: see also *Rae v. Fraser* (36 Sc. L. R. 782).

THE COURT (COLLINS, M.R., and ROMER and MATHEW, L.J.J.) allowed the appeal.

COLLINS, M.R., in the course of his judgment, said: The question was whether a man employed by a contractor who had undertaken to deliver a machine to a particular place, the third floor of certain premises, and there erect it, came within the definition of section 7, sub-section 2, of the Workmen's Compensation Act as a person engaged in engineering work. It seemed to him that there was no evidence that he was engaged in a work in "the construction of which machinery driven by steam, water, or other power was used." The evidence was the other way. The delivery of the parts to the third floor was no more engineering work than sending goods by train, i.e., steam transit, from Manchester to London. The parts of the contract were separate. To deliver was one part, to erect the other. There was no evidence that steam or other mechanical power was used for the purpose of erection to enable the judge to find that the man was engaged in engineering work within the meaning of the Act. The appeal must be allowed.—COUNSEL, *Shepherd; Rugg, K.C., and Bridgewater*. SOLICITORS, *William Hurd & Son; Walter & H. E. Foster, Leeds*.

[Reported by MAURICE N. DRUCKER, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

MARCHIONESS OF HUNTLY AND ANOTHER v. GASKELL AND ANOTHER. No. 2. 1st October; 1st Nov.

PRACTICE—PLEADING—EMBARRASSING ENDORSEMENT OF WRIT—ABUSE OF PROCESS OF THE COURT.

In this case the plaintiffs appealed from a decision of Kekewich, J. It appeared that the plaintiffs had commenced an action against the trustees of the will of Sir William Cunliffe Brooks, who was the father of the Marchioness of Huntly. The writ was indorsed with certain paragraphs which the defendants claimed were an abuse of the process of the court as being in relation to matters which should be determined by the Scotch courts. It was held by Kekewich, J., that some of the paragraphs must be struck out for the reason that the plaintiffs would not be entitled to relief on them, and others on the ground that the English courts could not decide the question, nor, if it were decided, could the judgment be here enforced. The plaintiffs appealed.

VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.J., held that the judgment of Kekewich, J., did not go far enough. In his opinion the court below should have struck out the whole of the indorsements and have left the plaintiffs to issue a new writ in which their claims should be clearly defined, and this would now be done, and the judgment of Kekewich, J., affirmed in substance, although the form of the remedy would differ.

STIRLING, L.J., agreed. The indorsements complained of were embarrassing.

COZENS-HARDY, L.J., was of the same opinion. It would not be right if the Court of Appeal could not stop what was clearly an abuse of the court's process in the fact of the plaintiffs having put forward claims framed deliberately in an embarrassing form. As the writ had not been issued *bona fide*, it was an abuse of process which would not be amended by the Court of Appeal. In his opinion the writ should be struck out entirely, with liberty to the plaintiffs to issue another writ free from the objections complained of. Appeal dismissed with costs.—COUNSEL, *P. Ogden Lawrence, K.C., and Ward Coldridge; Stewart Smith, K.C., and C. G. Church*. SOLICITORS, *I. C. Weatherley; H. G. Church*.

[Reported by HENRY STEPHEN, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

••ERRATUM.—*Wrigley v. Gill* (ante, p. 12): In the passage in the judgment of VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.J., "It is a case, therefore, in which it is for the mortgagor to prove that the event in which he is to get this advantage or right has actually taken place," "mortgagor" should be "mortgagee."

High Court—Chancery Division.

GILBEY v. RUSH. Kekewich, J. 1st and 2nd Nov.

SETTLED LAND—TENANT FOR LIFE—PRINCIPAL MANSION-HOUSE—LEASE—CONSENT OF TRUSTEES—SETTLED LAND ACT, 1890 (53 & 54 VICT. C. 69), s. 10.

This was an action by the plaintiff, Sir Walter Gilbey, to set aside a lease made by a tenant for life under the Settled Land Act. The facts were shortly as follows: By the will dated the 22nd of June, 1854, of G. W. Rush

the Elsenham Hall estate, in the county of Essex, and the Farthinghoe Lodge estate, in the county of Northampton, were settled to identical uses. At the date of the lease G. A. G. Rush was tenant for life in possession under the will of G. W. Rush, but the plaintiff was in occupation of Elsenham Hall under a lease. By a lease dated the 26th of September, 1902, G. W. Rush, as tenant for life, demised Farthinghoe Lodge to his wife, the defendant, for twenty-one years from the 29th of September, 1902, at the yearly rent of £140. This lease was negotiated and drawn up by the family estate agent and the son of the family solicitor, who were trustees of the will for the purposes of the Settled Land Act, and was approved of by them, but neither of them considered Farthinghoe Lodge to be the principal mansion-house of the settled land. The plaintiff had acquired by purchase the interest of the next tenant for life under the will in the Elsenham Hall and Farthinghoe Lodge estates. G. A. G. Rush died on the 2nd of November, 1903, without issue. The plaintiff now sought to set aside the lease on the ground (1) that it was not for the benefit of the estate as a whole and was made in fraud of the power; (2) that Farthinghoe Lodge was the principal mansion-house, and that section 10 of the Settled Land Act, 1890, which enacts that "the principal mansion-house on any settled land shall not be sold, exchanged, or leased by the tenant for life without the consent of the trustees of the settlement or an order of the court," had not been complied with on the ground that the trustees had not given their consent. The defendant alleged that the lease was for the benefit of the estate, and that if Farthinghoe Lodge was the principal mansion-house within the meaning of the Act, which she denied, a sufficient consent had been given by the trustees. The following cases were cited: *The Duchess of Sutherland v. The Duke of Sutherland* (42 W. R. 12; 1893, 3 Ch. 169), *Bateman v. Davis* (3 Maddock 98), *Greenham v. Gibbeson* (10 Bingham 363), *Pease v. Courtney* (53 W. R. 75; 1904, 2 Ch. 503).

KEKEWICH, J., in giving judgment, said that two questions were before the court of great interest and importance and of some novelty. His lordship could see no impropriety in a life tenant granting such a lease as had been granted in this case. The fact that in granting the lease the life tenant wished to provide for his wife was not in itself material. The real question was whether the lease was such a one as the tenant had power to grant. Here there was no injury done to the estate, and the lease was a perfectly proper one. On the question whether Farthinghoe Lodge could be considered "the principal mansion-house on any settled land," his lordship, without being prepared to say that there might not be two principal mansion-houses on the same settled lands—i.e., on lands held by the same tenant for life under the same title, held that in this case Elsenham Hall, and not Farthinghoe Lodge, was the principal mansion-house within the meaning of the Act. The question of consent, therefore, did not arise, but it had been argued, and his lordship thought it only fair to the parties that he should express his opinion on it. The consent must be given with full responsibility and with full knowledge coming home to the trustees that they were trustees for the purpose of the transaction in question. But the Act contained no definition of the consent required, it need not be in writing, nor need it be communicated to the parties so long as it is given. In this case both the trustees had taken an active part in the preparation of the lease and thoroughly approved of it. Why was not that sufficient? It was suggested that as the trustees did not consider Farthinghoe Lodge to be the principal mansion-house, they could not give their consent. But the answer to that was that both trustees gave their consent to the demise of Farthinghoe Lodge, and so long as they did that it was immaterial whether they thought it the principal mansion-house or not. His lordship held that the consent of the trustees had been given within the meaning of the Act. Judgment for the defendant with costs.—COUNSEL, *Stewart Smith, K.C., and Wace; Lawrence, K.C., and Pollock*. SOLICITORS, *Baileys, Shaw, & Gillett; Granville Smith, Coleman, Betts, & Co.*

[Reported by H. WOLCOTT WARNER, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

Re SIR H. M. STANLEY. TENNANT v. STANLEY. Buckley, J. 3rd Nov.

WILL—INVESTMENT CLAUSE—"ANY CORPORATION OR COMPANY, MUNICIPAL, COMMERCIAL, OR OTHERWISE"—COMPANY FORMED OR REGISTERED IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, BUT CARRYING ON BUSINESS ABROAD—COMPANY FORMED OR REGISTERED ABROAD.

Summons. By his will dated the 29th of November, 1899, Sir Henry Morton Stanley gave his residuary real and personal estate to his trustees upon the usual trusts for conversion and directed that the proceeds of such conversion should be invested in the trustees' names "in or upon any of the Parliamentary stocks or public funds or in Government securities of Great Britain or India or any British colony or dependency or any foreign country or state, or upon freehold, copyhold, leasehold, or chattel real securities in Great Britain but not in Ireland (such leasehold and chattel real securities to be upon hereditaments held for a term of which not less than fifty years should be unexpired at the date of investment), or on life interests in real or personal property together with a policy or policies on the life on which the property is held, or in the capital stock of the Bank of England or in stocks, funds, and securities not payable to bearer of any corporation or company, municipal, commercial or otherwise, or in any annuity whether permanent or terminable and whether now existing or hereafter to be created, the payment of which is charged on the revenues of India, or in any other mode of investment for the time being authorized by English law for the investment of trust funds." This summons asked (*inter alia*) whether under the words "in the stocks, funds, and securities not payable to bearer of any corporation or company, municipal, commercial, or otherwise," the trustees were authorized to invest the trust funds in the securities not payable to bearer of (a) any corporation or company formed or registered in the United Kingdom, but carrying

on business
tered outside
Ch. 352).

BUCKLEY,
not think it
tered in the
its business
sion "comp
incorporate
described
panies form
I could say
the debent
commercial
there is any
panies form
trustees me
in the Uni
Hollans.

Re HAMS

WILL—INT
STOCK—
TION ACT

The que
liable to m
alleged w
Coporation
Joseph h
estate to h
money su
payment
expenses
preference
company
to their sl
poration,
a like nat
fit any se
the fund
died in 1
sum of £
November
(being 2
sum of £
subsequ
of simil
Wakefel
proceeds
£940 Wa
of £1,600
total am
sum of
appointe
was app
17th of
sums of
the proc
the sum
1887, pr
in the m
company
authoriz
money i
in the
plaintiff
claiming
liable to
Corpora
testator
The
Wakef
terms of
for pur
and pay
field Co
nor was
called u
WAR
defend
Wakef
for the
questio
the wor
That p
power
because
me as
as exp
upon t
for the

on business abroad, or (b) any corporation or company formed or registered outside the United Kingdom. Counsel cited *Re Castlehow* (1903, 1 Ch. 352).

BUCKLEY, J., in giving judgment, said: It was not, and, indeed, I do not think it could be, seriously contended that a company formed or registered in the United Kingdom is outside the clause because it carries on its business abroad. The second question is more difficult. The expression "company" has no strict technical meaning, but includes any unincorporated association of persons so numerous as not to be fittingly described as a firm. There is no express limitation of the clause to companies formed or registered in the United Kingdom, and I do not see how I could say that the New York Railway Co. was not a "company" or that the debentures of a Canadian Railway Co. were not the securities of a commercial company. Nor do I think that, reading the whole clause, there is any sufficient context to restrict the meaning of the clause to companies formed or registered in the United Kingdom. Accordingly the trustees may invest in the securities of a company not formed or registered in the United Kingdom.—COUNSEL, *G. R. Northcote*; *R. J. Parker*; *W. E. Hollans*. SOLICITORS, *Trooper, Still, Freeling & Parkin*.

[Reported by T. PARKINIAN LAW, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

Re HAMSHAW (DECEASED). HAMSHAW AND ANOTHER v. STEAD AND ANOTHER. Warrington, J. 1st Nov.

WILL—INVESTMENT CLAUSE—INVESTMENT IN WAKEFIELD CORPORATION STOCK—LIABILITY OF TRUSTEES FOR DEPRECIATION—WAKEFIELD CORPORATION ACT, 1887 (50 & 51 VICT. c. 71), s. 105.

The question in this action was whether the trustees under a will were liable to make good the loss accruing to the trust estate by reason of the alleged wrongful investment of portion of the trust funds in Wakefield Corporation Stock. By his will dated the 9th of October, 1885, the testator, Joseph Hamshaw (subject to certain specific gifts), bequeathed his personal estate to his trustees upon trust to get in, collect, and convert into ready money such part thereof as should not consist of money, and after payment thereof of the testator's just debts and funeral and testamentary expenses to invest the residue, *inter alia*, "upon mortgage debentures or the preference or guaranteed shares, or the stocks or securities of any public company incorporated by special Act of Parliament and paying dividends to their shareholders, or upon the mortgages or bonds of any municipal corporation," with power from time to time to vary such securities for others of a like nature, and with power also to retain or change as they should think fit any securities held by the testator at the time of his death, and to hold the fund so invested upon the trusts in the will contained. The testator died in 1887, part of his personal estate at that date consisting of the sum of £939 10s. 3½d. 3¼ per cent. Wakefield Corporation Stock. In November, 1887, the trustees and executors appointed by the will (being the defendant Stead and one Oliver Spurr) invested the sum of £400 in the purchase of £400 Wakefield Corporation Stock, and subsequently in November, 1892, a sum of £76 10s. in the purchase of £80 of similar stock. In the year 1893 the £939 10s. 3½d. 3¼ per cent. Wakefield Corporation Stock was redeemed by the corporation, and the proceeds of such redemption applied by the trustees in the purchase of £940 Wakefield Corporation Stock; in the following year a further sum of £1,600 was applied in the purchase of £1,600 similar stock, bringing the total amount of such stock purchased and held by the trustees to the sum of £3,020. In the year 1902 Oliver Spurr, one of the trustees appointed by the will, died, and the defendant George Firth Nurse was appointed trustee in his place by an indenture dated the 17th of November, 1903. On the 5th of March, 1905, the various sums of Wakefield Corporation Stock held by the trustees were sold, and the proceeds of the sale resulted in a loss to the trust estate amounting to the sum of £375 13s. Section 105 (1) of the Wakefield Corporation Act, 1887, provided that "trustees . . . being authorized to invest money in the mortgages, debentures, or debenture stock of any railway or other company, shall, unless the contrary is provided by the instrument authorizing the investment, have the same power of investing that money in corporation stock . . . as they have of investing it in the mortgages, debentures, or debenture stock as aforesaid." The plaintiffs (two of the beneficiaries under the will) brought this action claiming that the defendants, or in any case the defendant Stead, were liable to make good the sum of £375 13s. to the trust estate, Wakefield Corporation Stock not being an investment authorized by the will of the testator.

The plaintiffs contended that the word *any* in section 105 of the Wakefield Corporation Act, 1887, denoted universality, whereas by the terms of the will the trustees were limited to a special class of companies for purposes of investment—viz., such as were incorporated by special Act and paid dividends to their shareholders. In this case, therefore, Wakefield Corporation Stock was not an investment authorized by section 105, nor was it an investment authorized by the will. The defendants were not called upon.

WARRINGTON, J.—The question in this case is whether the first defendant is liable for the loss accruing through the investments in Wakefield Corporation Stock, and whether the second defendant is liable for the loss accruing through the retention of those investments. One question which arises is whether Wakefield Corporation Stock comes within the words of the will, "mortgages or bonds of any municipal corporation." That point I shall not attempt to determine. It is also argued that the power of investment given by section 105 does not in this case apply because of the provisions made by the will as to investment. It seems to me as though the plaintiffs are asking me to read the words of the power as expressed in the will into section 105. It is one of those cases turning upon the meaning of words in which it is almost impossible to give reasons for the view arrived at. In my opinion Wakefield Corporation Stock is in

this case an investment within the powers conferred by section 105 of the Wakefield Corporation Act, 1887. There will, therefore, be judgment for the defendants with costs.—COUNSEL, *Terrell, K.C.*, and *Joseph Gately*; *Rouden, K.C.*, and *W. H. Cozens Hardy*. SOLICITORS, *Hamlin, Grammer, & Hamlin*, for *Harland & Ingham*, Leeds; *Clements, Williams, & Co.*, for *Mander & Co.*, Wakefield.

[Reported by E. WATKILL RIDGES, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court of Justice—King's Bench Division.

MORLEY AND ANOTHER v. BEVINGTON Div. Court. 6th Nov.

PRACTICE—COUNTY COURT—INTERLOCUTORY PROCEEDINGS—CERTIFICATE FOR COUNSEL'S FEES—OMISSION TO ASK COSTS OF JUDGE—GOOD CAUSE—LIBERTY TO APPLY—COUNTY COURT RULES, XII. 11; LIII. 7.

Appeal from the decision of the judge of Edmonton County Court on a point of practice. The plaintiffs claimed the sum of £43 15s. for royalties due to the 1st of January, 1905, for an account, and for a declaration. The defendant claimed to set off a sum of £119. Judgment was entered for the defendant in the plaintiff's claim for £43 15s., and for the plaintiffs for their claim to an account and declaration, and it was ordered that the defendant should pay the plaintiffs' costs of and incidental to the non-filing of the defendant's affidavit of documents, and of and incidental to the plaintiffs' application for a further and better discovery of documents than appears by the affidavit of documents filed on behalf of the defendant. Except as before stated each party to pay his own costs with liberty to apply. Subsequently an application was made under the above order that the costs awarded under such order to the plaintiffs be taxed under Scale C, and also for a certificate that the two applications to the court as to obtaining an affidavit of documents by the defendant were fit for counsel. The application for counsel's fee was refused by the judge, as the application should have been made at the trial under ord. 12, r. 11, and that the "omission to ask" was not sufficient "good cause" under ord. 53, r. 7, of the County Court Rules, which is as follows: "The order of the judge required for the allowance of any of the following items in the scale—viz., items 3, 31, 70, 86, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, or for allowance of any particular costs under any of the County Court Rules shall be a special order made upon the particular facts of the case, and not a general order; and the application for such allowance or for any certificate under section 119 of the Act shall be made at or immediately after the trial or hearing; and if not so made shall not afterwards be entertained unless the judge for good cause otherwise orders." If the application had been made at the trial the judge would have allowed counsel's fee. Counsel for the appellant argued that, having obtained a judgment with "leave to apply," he was entitled to apply for the certificate upon such a judgment, and ord. 53, r. 7, in such a case did not apply (*Harris v. Hillsford*, 20 L. T. 216). Under ord. 53, r. 7, however, there was "good cause"—namely, that, having omitted to ask for the certificate at the trial, he had in fact seized the earliest opportunity to make the application, whereby he had saved the judge the inconvenience of re-hearing the case.

THE COURT (Lord ALVERSTONE, C.J., and WILLS and DARLING, JJ.) dismissed the appeal.

LORD ALVERSTONE, C.J., in the course of his judgment, said: We cannot help feeling sympathy with counsel over what was a mere slip; but it seems to me we would go a great deal too far if we overruled the county court judge's discretion in this case. The judge says if he had been asked at the proper time he would have given the certificate. But mere delay cannot be sufficient cause for entertaining the application. [His lordship read the rule.] It seems to me that there is here nothing upon which the county court judge could be asked to say, or that we could be asked to say, there was good cause to entertain the application. The point that there was liberty to apply under the judgment would clearly not do. It cannot be used to nullify the effect of the omission to do that without which the rule specifically directs the matter shall not be entertained. However hard it may be, the appeal must be dismissed with costs.—COUNSEL, *Short*; *J. A. Symmons*. SOLICITORS, *Westmacott*; *C. R. & F. H. Stearns*.

[Reported by MAURICE N. DROCQUE, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

KIRBY AND ANOTHER v. BARBER Div. Court. 7th Nov.

REGISTRATION OF ELECTORS—PARLIAMENTARY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORS—OCCUPIERS—CLAIM BY JOINT LESSEES OF PREMISES OF THE YEARLY VALUE OF £20—ARRESTER ON PREMISES WITH SERVICE VOTE—INSUFFICIENCY OF PREMISES TO SUPPORT THREE VOTES—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACTS, 1867 (30 & 31 VICT. c. 102), s. 27; AND 1884 (48 VICT. c. 3), s. 5.

Appeal from the decision of the revising barrister for the Petersfield Division of Hampshire. The case stated that H. J. A. Kirby and J. C. Warner duly claimed to be inserted in the Occupiers' List (Division I.) of the Parliamentary and Local Government electors for the parish of Bishop's Waltham in respect of their joint occupation of certain offices in St. George's-square, Bishop's Waltham. The claimants carry on in partnership the business of solicitors, under the style of C. Warner & Kirby, at Winchester and Bishop's Waltham at the above premises which they held under a lease at a rental of £20 a year. With the exception of three rooms the house is occupied by them for their business, but these three rooms were occupied by one William Gamblin and his wife, Mrs. Gamblin being employed and paid to act as caretaker. The name of William Gamblin stands upon the occupiers' list, Division II., and no objection was made to it so remaining. The claim was opposed on the ground that the claimants

could not be placed upon the list so long as William Gamblin remained upon the list as qualified to vote, and the effect of doing so would be to put three voters on the register in respect of the occupation of premises of the clear yearly value of £20 and no more, contrary to the provisions of section 27 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 102 as read with section 5 of 48 Vict. c. 3. The revising barrister held that the objection was valid. The claimants appealed. It was submitted for the claimants that granting Gamblin was on the list rightly or wrongly, that was no reason why the claimants should not be put on the list too. The presence of his name on the list could not detract from the appellants' right, because he was on the list either as a service voter or he ought not to be on the list at all. For the respondent it was contended that Gamblin occupied as a tenant, although not so found in terms by the revising barrister, and that his interest as such must be deducted from the value of the premises. At whatever figure that interest was put at it would leave the value of the claimants' joint occupation less than £20, and as both partners claimed their interest in the premises would be less than the minimum of £10 each.

THE COURT (LORD ALVERSTONE, C.J., and WILLS and DARLING, JJ.) dismissed the appeal.

DARLING, J., pointing out that the case was decided on its particular facts. They were not asked to decide whether a claim by one of the partners in the circumstances would have been valid.—COUNSEL, *Lister Drummond*; F. F. Daldy. SOLICITORS, Rawle, Johnson, & Co., for A. F. M. Downie, Alton, Hants; Gibson & Weldon, for P. C. Burley, Petersfield.

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

SMILES & SON v. HANS DRESSEN & CO. Channell, J. 2nd Nov.

BREACH OF CHARTER-PARTY.

The plaintiffs' claim was for a declaration that they were entitled to a sum of £160 paid to the Barry Railway Co. and for payment to them of that sum, and for £140 damages breach of the charter-party. A cargo of timber was carried from Jakobstad to Barry. The defendants were taken to be the indorsees of the bill of lading relating thereto. On the 26th of June the vessel arrived. Notice to berth was not given until the 4th of July. The discharge commenced on the 5th of July to the Barry Railway Co., as agents for the shipper's agent. Freight was not paid, and the discharge was stopped on the 7th of July. On the 8th of July the defendants were appointed agents of the shipper. The freight remained unpaid and the plaintiffs kept the timber on the vessel until the 13th of July, when under the powers of sections 493 and 494 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, the plaintiffs commenced landing the timber and placing it in the custody of the Barry Railway Co., with notice of lien. If there had been no delay the discharge could have been completed on the 13th of July, but in the events which happened it was not completed till the 21st of July. The defendants paid £160 (£20 per diem demurrage for eight days) to the Barry Railway Co. and received the timber. The bill of lading provided that the timber was to be delivered at Barry, the consignees to pay freight and all other conditions as per charter-party. The charter-party provided that the cargo should be received from the vessel in the manner and at the rate customary at the port during customary working hours, and if the vessel was further detained through the fault of the charterers, ten days on demurrage over and above the laying days were to be paid for at the rate of £20 per diem. Owners to have absolute lien on cargo for freight. The defendants contended that the plaintiffs should have landed the timber under the powers of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, s. 493, subject to a lien, and not to have used the ship as a warehouse. The plaintiffs contended that they were not entitled to land the timber on the 7th of July subject to a lien under the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, and that, under the circumstances, they had acted reasonably in keeping the goods on board.

CHANNELL, J., held that the plaintiffs were not in a position, on the 7th of July, to exercise the powers granted by the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, s. 493. A shipowner could not land goods subject to a lien under that Act until a time so near the demurrage days that it would be impracticable for the delivery to be taken in time. On the 7th of July the owner of the goods had not committed a default, as he had time in which to take the goods. Judgment for the plaintiffs: £160, the declaration asked for, and £140 damages.—COUNSEL, *Scrutton, K.C.*, *Adair Roche*, and *H. L. Tebb*; *Robson, K.C.*, and *Bailhache*. SOLICITORS, *Butterell & Roche*; *Trinder, Capron, & Co.*

[Reported by W. T. TUSTON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

Solicitors' Cases.

Solicitors Ordered to be Struck Off the Rolls.

Nov. 6.—HARRY SCOTT, 8, Breems-buildings, Chancery-lane, W.C.
Nov. 8.—THOMAS PARKER ORWIN, Hamilton-road, Longsight, Manchester.

Nov. 8.—GEORGE JASON PHILLIPS, St. Giles-street, Northampton.

Solicitor Ordered to be Suspended.

Nov. 6.—WILLIAM GEORGE DAVIES, of Wellington-road and Blackheath-road. Suspended for six months.

Mr. Justice Buckley announced on Thursday in last week that he would shortly hear certain witness actions, the names of which he did not yet know, from the list of Mr. Justice Swinfen Eady, but that the cases would not be taken before the 13th inst.

Law Societies.

Law Association.

The usual monthly meeting of the directors was held at the Law Society's Hall on Thursday, the 2nd inst., Mr. T. H. Gardiner in the chair. The others directors present were Mr. T. Dolling Bolton, M.P., Mr. S. J. Daw, Mr. H. C. Nisbet, Mr. R. H. Peacock, Mr. J. Vallance, Mr. Mark Waters, and Mr. W. M. Woodhouse, with the secretary, Mr. E. E. Barron. A sum of £50 was voted for the relief of London solicitors' widows, and other general business transacted.

Solicitors' Benevolent Association.

The usual monthly meeting of the board of directors of this association was held at the Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, on the 8th inst., Mr. Henry A. Peake (Sleaford) in the chair, the other directors present being Sir George Lewis, Bart., and Messrs. Alfred Davenport, W. Dowson, R. Ellett (Cirencester), W. H. Gray, J. Roger B. Gregory, W. G. King, C. G. May, R. Pennington, J.P., W. Arthur Sharpe, R. S. Taylor, Maurice A. Tweedie, and J. T. Scott (secretary). A sum of £950 was distributed in grants of relief, ninety-three new members were admitted to the association, and other general business transacted.

Law Students' Journal.

The Law Society.

SCHOLARSHIPS EXAMINATION, 1905.

After written and oral examination, and consideration of the candidates' testimonials and references, the Council have awarded the following scholarships, value £50 per annum each and tenable for three years, on condition that the holder proceeds to pursue, under proper supervision, a course of legal studies approved by the Council:

CLASS A.

(Candidates under nineteen years of age not yet articulated.)

Mr. Thomas Armitage Hewitt, of Mill Hill School.

CLASS B.

(Graduates of any age not yet articulated.)

No scholarships awarded.

CLASS C.

(Articled clerks of not more than two years' standing.)

Mr. George Gavan Duffy, educated at Stonyhurst College, and articled with Mr. H. T. Birks, of London.

Mr. Ivor Evans, B.A., educated at Shrewsbury School, and at University College, Oxford, articled with Mr. Evan Evans, of Aberystwyth.

Mr. Alfred Denys Strickland Rogers, LL.B., educated at the Royal Masonic School, Bushey, and at St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, articled with Mr. Francis W. Darch, of London.

An extra scholarship in this class is awarded to Mr. Bernard Albert Schooling, educated at University School, Stroud Green, and articled with Mr. William Gamble, of London.

CLASS D.

(Articled clerks of not more than four years' standing.)

Mr. Frank Benthall Stevens, B.A., LL.B., educated at the Leys School, and Christ's College, Cambridge, articled with Mr. William Stevens, of Brighton.

Mr. Frederick Augustus Carlton Smith, educated at the City of London School, and articled with Mr. W. G. Snowden Gard, of London.

Mr. Leonard Stanistreet Holmes, LL.B., educated at Liverpool College and the University of Liverpool, and articled with Mr. A. A. Miller, of Liverpool.

Council of Legal Education.

The following are the awards of the council upon the Michaelmas examination held in Gray's-inn Hall on the 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th of October. L.I. means Lincoln's-inn, I.T. Inner Temple, M.T. Middle Temple, and G.I. Gray's-inn:—

ROMAN LAW.

Class I.—G. W. H. Jones, G.I.; J. H. Kemp, L.I.; Nripendra N. Sircar, L.I.

Class II.—E. V. Bacon, I.T.; F. E. Bradshaw, M.T.; J. A. Cherry, G.I.; N. Cockshutt, I.T.; N. de L. Davis, M.T.; Praboth C. D6, G.I.; A. C. Fox-Davies, L.I.; H. M. Green, G.I.; T. R. Harker, M.T.; J. Johnston, L.I.; P. L. Quillet, M.T.; L. W. Ritch, L.I.; R. M. Sebag-Montefiore, I.T.; A. Taylor, M.T.; G. H. Walker, L.I.; R. W. H. Wilkinson, I.T.

Class III.—C. T. Agar, L.I.; Shaikh M. Ahmad, M.T.; P. B. Austin, L.I.; C. L. Bennett, I.T.; C. P. Blackwell, I.T.; P. M. Carleton, G.I.; Fakir Chand, L.I.; Toon Chin, M.T.; J. R. Coombes, M.T.; O. B. Cooper, G.I.; J. A. Copland, M.T.; G. H. Corringham, L.I.; Dewau S. Dass, I.T.; A. Davis, M.T.; C. C. Deans, L.I.; E. E. Dent, L.I.; Hubert C. de Sanges, G.I.; E. Duke, G.I.; F. W. Dunn, G.I.; R. C. Dunn-Gardner, I.T.; Promothonath Dutt, M.T.; G. M. FitzGerald, I.T.; B. F. Fletcher, I.T.; C. G. E. Fletcher, G.I.; C. J. D. Frooth, M.T.; Rokunosuke Hamaguchi, M.T.; J. B. Johnson, I.T.; J. R.

Kenyon, I.T.
M. MacMahon
Mukerjee, M.
Noian, I.T.;
M.T.; J. P.
G. C. Rees, M.
W. Saise, G.
vragam, I.T.
I.T.; T. F.
P. Walton, I.
The numb
"postponed"

CONSTITUTION.

Class I.—
Class II.—
G.I.; E. S.
P. Wicks, M.
Class III.—
G.I.; M. M.
Ba Thein, I.
C. T. Blake
M.T.; S. M.
M. P. Chou
Cooke, I.T.
I.T.; A. H.
Ferrers, I.T.
G.I.; F. B.
R. S. Grah
A. C. Hers
E. I. J. E.
Lloyd-Gres
Naidu, G.I.
M.T.; Pes
G.I.; G. C.
Pearson, G.
J. C. H. Se
M.T.; C. F.
M.T.; J. T.
Walton, I.
Woodhead
The num
candidates
The spec
awarded to

Class I.

Stevens, I.
L.I.; Sat
Class I.
G.I.; H.
G. M. Do
M.T.; G.
M.T.; T.
A. S. Pre
Rentoul,
W. W. S.
R. V. Ve
Class
Jnanendu
L.I.; W.
M.T.; V.
I.T.; C.
G.I.; J.
A. J. S.
J. A. C.
Abdul R.
E. E. Lo
A. Man
Ndubu
A. Quad
Rattan
Profullo
Stonier,
Wagner
M.T.; J.
The n
The
Lincoln

Class and G.

Class
M. H.
Young
stein,
Slader
A. L.
and F.
Richte
I.T.;

Kenyon, I.T.; Parmeshwar Lal, M.T.; W. H. P. Lewis, I.T.; N. O. M. MacMahon, I.T.; A. E. Milne, G.I.; R. J. J. Modi, M.T.; Kesar L. Mukerjee, M.T.; J. M. Myers, I.T.; the Hon. A. E. Napier, I.T.; R. D. Nolan, I.T.; T. A. Pace, L.I.; Rahimtulla K. Pirbhai, L.I.; J. M. Pollen, M.T.; J. Poyser, M.T.; G. W. Proffitt, L.I.; Shaikh A. Quadir, L.I.; G. C. Rees, M.T.; Rajaratnam V. Rhenius, M.T.; B. Richmond, M.T.; W. Saise, G.I.; J. Shaw, M.T.; E. W. Shepperson, G.I.; S. T. Srinivasagam, I.T.; W. Taylor, G.I.; R. J. L. Tindall, M.T.; Lord Tiverton, I.T.; T. F. Tremearne, L.I.; L. Tyfield, I.T.; D. A. L. Uleccq, M.T.; P. Walton, L.I.; H. M. Wise, M.T.

The number examined was 108, of whom 77 passed. One candidate was "postponed" until the Trinity examination, 1906.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW (ENGLISH AND COLONIAL) AND LEGAL HISTORY.

Class I.—G. W. H. Jones, G.I.

Class II.—T. R. Harker, M.T.; F. C. J. C. Jenkin, G.I.; R. W. Leach, G.I.; E. S. Montagu, I.T.; Myle G. Naidu, M.T.; H. V. Phillips, L.I.; P. Wicks, M.T.

Class III.—J. Agnew, I.T.; N. N. Anklesaria, G.I.; Syed M. Askeri, G.I.; M. M. Bakht, L.I.; V. G. Bapat, M.T.; J. T. Barry, I.T.; Maung Ba Thein, L.I.; K. C. Berrington, L.I.; Kundanmal A. Bhojwani, M.T.; C. T. Blakeway, I.T.; Debendra N. Bonarjee, L.I.; A. de B. Brandon, M.T.; S. M. Bruce, M.T.; E. H. H. Carille, I.T.; Fakir Chand, L.I.; M. P. Choudhuri, L.I.; R. R. Churchill, I.T.; N. Cockshutt, I.T.; O. H. Cooke, I.T.; E. R. Crundall, I.T.; L. G. Dibdin, L.I.; G. M. Dodwell, I.T.; A. H. Douglas, M.T.; P. Dutt, M.T.; C. L. Fawell, L.I.; B. C. Ferrers, I.T.; A. H. Forbes, M.T.; A. C. Fox-Davies, L.I.; T. H. Fry, G.I.; F. B. Galer, I.T.; R. J. T. Gibson, I.T.; G. V. Godfrey, L.I.; R. S. Graham, M.T.; H. J. Grisewood, I.T.; F. A. Hayley, M.T.; A. C. Hershensohn, M.T.; J. A. C. Highmore, I.T.; G. W. Hornsby, L.I.; E. I. J. Hyam, M.T.; J. T. Jenkins, G.I.; Mir A. Khan, L.I.; P. Lloyd-Greame, I.T.; E. Lunge, G.I.; Hem O. Majumdar, G.I.; P. R. Naidu, G.I.; W. F. Noyce, L.I.; Moung B. Oung, M.T.; S. Packer, M.T.; Peshotan D. S. Patel, M.T.; A. S. Preston, I.T.; Ram Rattau, G.I.; G. C. Rees, M.T.; Rajaratnam V. Rhenius, M.T.; W. H. Riley-Pearson, G.I.; W. J. Sanderson, I.T.; Kaikobad E. J. Sanjana, G.I.; J. C. H. Seale, I.T.; A. G. T. Settle, M.T.; N. N. Sircar, L.I.; E. Smith, M.T.; C. G. R. Solomon, I.T.; J. T. Stephens, I.T.; C. L. R. Thomas, M.T.; F. C. Thompson, M.T.; J. B. Thompson, M.T.; Lord Tiverton, I.T.; J. Tootell, L.I.; F. H. Toynce, I.T.; R. F. Truscott, I.T.; P. Walton, L.I.; W. D. Ward, I.T.; R. E. Willcocks, M.T.; E. T. Woodhead, I.T.; W. F. Wright, M.T.; M. Young, L.I.

The number of candidates examined was 124, of whom 83 passed. Three candidates were "postponed" until the Easter examination, 1906. The special prize of £50 was not awarded. The prize would have been awarded to Mr. G. W. H. Jones had he not been disqualified by age.

EVIDENCE, PROCEDURE, AND CRIMINAL LAW.

Class I.—W. L. Blease, L.I.; G. F. Carter, G.I.; W. O. Cleveland-Stevens, L.I.; T. R. Harker, M.T.; J. H. Kemp, L.I.; R. M. Lowe, L.I.; Satya P. Mitra, G.I.; R. Peach, G.I.; W. ap H. Thomas, M.T.

Class II.—J. Agnew, I.T.; E. B. Amplett, I.T.; J. C. P. Borrajo, G.I.; H. Clover, I.T.; N. Cockshutt, I.T.; C. Cozens-Smith, M.T.; G. M. Dodwell, I.T.; P. Dutt, M.T.; C. L. Fawell, L.I.; P. H. Hanson, M.T.; G. T. W. Hayes, M.T.; F. A. Hayley, M.T.; A. C. Hershensohn, M.T.; T. Jameson, G.I.; R. E. Laurie, M.T.; H. G. Mackewitt, I.T.; A. S. Preston, I.T.; G. C. Rees, M.T.; R. M. D. Reid, I.T.; G. S. C. Rentoul, G.I.; W. Saise, G.I.; J. E. Salmon, G.I.; W. N. Sircar, L.I.; W. W. Salumper, L.I.; W. H. Taylor, M.T.; A. K. à B. Terrell, L.I.; R. V. Vernon, I.T.; O. R. Walker, M.T.

Class III.—Morounful Abayomi, M.T.; N. N. Anklesaria, G.I.; Janendra C. Bagchi, G.I.; W. H. D. Bell, M.T.; K. C. Berrington, L.I.; W. J. Bowker, L.I.; G. N. Brabner, M.T.; A. de B. Brandon, M.T.; W. R. Briggs, M.T.; J. C. Buchanan, L.I.; A. R. Churchill, I.T.; C. J. F. Cobbold, I.T.; W. L. F. Davies, I.T.; Mian M. Din, G.I.; J. E. Eminsang, L.I.; B. C. Ferrers, I.T.; J. Goddard, M.T.; A. J. S. Hamilton, L.I.; H. C. Harbord, I.T.; A. R. Henry, I.T.; J. A. C. Highmore, I.T.; G. T. Husain, M.T.; Ahmed Kareem, L.I.; Abdul K. Khan, M.T.; J. C. P. Kinsman, L.I.; A. H. L. Leach, G.I.; E. E. Leader, I.T.; P. Lloyd-Greame, I.T.; Priya K. Majumdar, G.I.; A. Mangena, L.I.; E. F. W. Moseley, M.T.; P. R. Naidu, G.I.; S. Ndubuisi-Lewis, I.T.; J. M. Ormond, I.T.; G. P. Pillai, M.T.; Shaikh A. Quadir, L.I.; M. K. Rahman, M.T.; J. G. H. Randies, I.T.; Ram Rattan, G.I.; Kaikobad E. J. Sanjana, G.I.; Dalip S. Sharma, G.I.; Profullo C. Sinha, M.T.; M. V. Smith, M.T.; N. H. Smith, I.T.; G. A. Stoner, G.I.; A. S. van Hees, I.T.; J. G. V. van Soelen, M.T.; E. A. S. Wagner, I.T.; P. Walton, L.I.; A. F. Wilding, I.T.; J. G. Willis, M.T.; E. T. Woodhead, I.T.; B. W. Worthington, I.T.

The number of candidates examined was 105, of whom 90 passed. The special prize of £50 was awarded to Mr. W. L. Blease, of Lincoln's Inn.

FINAL.

Class I.—Certificates of Honour.—Changatharail G. Idiebandy, M.T., and G. H. Mould, G.I., eq.

Class II.—In Order of Merit.—T. R. Harker, M.T.; A. S. Ward, L.I.; M. H. W. Hayward, L.I.; F. Buckley, G.I.; A. H. Woolf, I.T.; T. P. Young, I.T.; H. P. Duval, L.I.; A. S. Preston, I.T.; H. D. J. Boden-stein, M.T.; Dhirajlal Keshaval Thakor, L.I.; A. Cross, I.T.; C. H. Y. Slader, G.I.; Sailendra N. Banerjee, G.I.; W. F. L. Braidwood, M.T.; A. L. Cartar, G.I.; C. E. Brackenbury, M.T.; V. M. Fernando, I.T.; and F. Holland, I.T., eq.; G. C. Rees, M.T.; R. Peach, G.I.; A. H. L. Richter, I.T.; N. Cockshutt, I.T.; Guru S. Dutt, G.I.; T. N. P. Palmer, I.T.; F. D. Shelton, M.T.; J. M. A. G. Roussel, M.T.

Class III. (In alphabetical order).—N. P. Adams, I.T.; J. E. P. Allen, I.T.; W. E. Boustfield, I.T.; A. Cecil, I.T.; Shanker B. Changan, G.I.; L. P. Clay, I.T.; J. T. N. Cole, M.T.; Charu C. Das, G.I.; Profulla R. Das, M.T.; H. H. S. Davies, G.I.; O. J. H. Davis, G.I.; C. T. Flower, I.T.; N. S. Fouquereaux, M.T.; T. H. Fry, G.I.; G. Le M. Gruchy, M.T.; G. L. Hardy, I.T.; J. G. Henriques, I.T.; R. D. Hodgson, I.T.; S. Asghar Husain, G.I.; H. F. King, M.T.; W. R. Levy, L.I.; O. S. Locker-Lampson, I.T.; J. H. H. Manley, M.T.; J. W. Orr, I.T.; Sadashiva R. Pandit, I.T.; R. M. B. Parker, I.T.; C. G. Pearson, I.T.; P. A. Pallerin, L.I.; R. F. P. Philipson-Stow, I.T.; Ramanathan Rajendran, I.T.; Surendra N. Ray, I.T.; A. H. Rix, G.I.; M. S. Saldanha, I.T.; F. B. Sharp, G.I.; J. B. Sharpe, L.I.; F. Shaw, I.T.; R. A. P. Sriwardana, G.I.; G. ten Bosch, I.T.; S. G. Turner, M.T.; J. G. V. van Soelen, M.T.; O. R. Walker, M.T.; E. P. Walsh, G.I.; E. A. Winder, G.I.; A. E. S. Wynell-Mayow, M.T.

The number of candidates examined was 89, of whom 72 passed. One candidate was "postponed" until the Easter examination, 1906.

Law Students' Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.—Nov. 7.—The subject for discussion was: "That the House of Lords by its rejection of the Tramways Bill has shown once more that its actions do not have behind them the support of public opinion." Mr. E. B. Ames opened in the affirmative; Mr. Neville Tebbutt opened in the negative. The following members also spoke: Messrs. Cornock, Blackwell, Oates, H. M. Myers, H. H. Kain, T. Harston, Birch, McNavie, William Weller, and Newman. The motion was lost by three votes.

Colonial Stock Act, 1900.

(63 & 64 Vict. c. 62.)

LIST OF STOCKS UNDER SECTION 2.

The provisions of the Colonial Stock Act, 1900, have been complied with in respect of the undermentioned stocks, registered or inscribed in the United Kingdom.

Barbados 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1925-42).
British Guiana 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1935); 3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1923-45).

British Honduras.*
Canada, Dominion of 4 per cent. Loans of 1874, 1875, 1876, and 1878-9; 3½ per cent. Loan (1909-34); 4 per cent. Reduced Loan; 4 per cent. Loan (1910-35); 3 per cent. Loan; 2½ per cent. Loan.
Cape of Good Hope 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock of 1882 (1917-1923); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock of 1883 (1923); 4 per cent. Consolidated Stock (1916-1936); 3½ per cent. Consolidated Stock (1929-1949); 3 per cent. Consolidated Stock (1933-1943).

Ceylon 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1934); 3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1940).
Gold Coast 3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1927-52).
Grenada 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1917-42).
Hongkong 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1918-43).
Jamaica 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1934); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1919-1949); 3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1922-1944).
Lagos 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1930-1955).
Mauritius 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1937).
Natal 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1927); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1937); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1914-39); 3 per cent. Consolidated Stock (1929-49); 3½ per cent. Consolidated Stock (1934-44).
Newfoundland 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1905).
New South Wales 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1933); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1924); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1918); 3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1935).

New Zealand 4 per cent. Consolidated Stock (1929); 3½ per cent. Consolidated Stock (1940); 3 per cent. Consolidated Stock (1945).
Queensland 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1915); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1924); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1924); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1930); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1945); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1921); 3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1922-47).
St. Lucia 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1919-44).
St. Vincent.*

Sierra Leone* 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1929-1954).
South Australia 4 per cent. Stocks (1917, 1918, and 1924); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1916-35); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1917-36); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1939); 3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1916-26); 3 per cent. Consolidated Inscribed Stock (1916).
Straits Settlement.*

Tasmania 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1920-40); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1920-40); 3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1920-40).
Trinidad and Tobago.—Trinidad 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1917-42); Trinidad 3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1922-44).
Victoria 4 per cent. Railway Loan of 1881 (1907); 4 per cent. Redemption Loan of 1882 (1908); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock of 1883 (1913); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock of 1884 (1919); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock of 1885 (1920); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock of 1888-9 (1923); 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1921-26); 4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1911-26); 3 per cent. Consolidated Inscribed Stock (1929-49); 3½ per cent. Consolidated Inscribed Stock (1920-49).

* The necessary steps to comply with the conditions laid down by the Treasury under the Act have been taken by the Government of these Colonies, but no stocks have up to the present been issued by them under the Colonial Stock Acts, 1857-1900.

The Property Mart.

Sales of the Ensuing Week.

- Nov. 14.—Mr. FREDERICK WARREN, F.A.I., at the Mart, at 2.—Freehold Ground-rents of £48, rack-rents £300 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Naunton & Son, London. (See advertisement, Nov. 4, p. xx.)
- Nov. 15. Messrs. ABENHAM, TRENCHARD & Co. (in conjunction with Messrs. MATTHEWS MATTHEWS & GOODMAN, at Winchester House, Old Broad-street, E.C. (in the Great Arsenal Station (South-Eastern and Chatham Railway).—The Sixth Portion of the Burage Estate: Highly important and valuable Freehold Properties, comprising a very large number of Houses, shops, and other Premises, situate in New-road, Cross-street, Burrage-road, Raglan-road, Maxey-road, Hudson-road, Vicarage-road, Coupland-terrace, Church-terrace, Lee-street, St. Margaret's-terrace, and Plumstead Common-road, including several Detached Residences, a Fully-licensed Public-house and Two Beerhouses, also a commanding Building site (recently cleared) situate on the west side of New-road, near the Arsenal Railway Station, having a frontage of upwards of 120 ft. and an area of about 9,600 square feet, adapted for the erection of good class Shops and Business Premises. The present income amounts to about £1,480 per annum, chiefly arising from very low ground-rents, with early reversions, the remainder of the Properties being let on yearly, weekly, and other tenancies. The estimated rack-rent of the whole is now about £10,000 per annum. Substantial Premiums may be anticipated for renewals of the leases of the licensed houses on or before the expiry of the present terms. Solicitors, Messrs. G. F. Hudson, Matthews & Co., London. (See advertisement, Nov. 4, p. xx.)
- Nov. 15.—Messrs. SALTER, REE, & Co. at the Mart, at 2.—Camden Town: Freehold Ground-rents, £38 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Vaughan & Buss, London.—Kensington Town, No. 23, Lupton-street: Long Leasehold House; let at £50. Solicitor, A. J. Murray, Esq., London.—Gospel Oak-grove: Three-floor Factory; lease 98 years; ground-rent £13, with possession; also the Leasehold House, No. 4, Gospel Oak-grove; let at £33 per annum; lease 98 years. Solicitors, Messrs. Chester, Broome, & Griffiths, 26, Bedford-row, London. (See advertisements, Nov. 4, p. xxi.)
- Nov. 16.—Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CHAMFIELD, at the Mart, at 2:—
- REVERSIONS:
- To One-thirtieth of a Trust Fund, value £23,000; gentleman aged 63. Solicitors, Messrs. Gibson, Usher, & Co., London.
 - To One-fifth of a Trust Fund, value £17,000; lady aged 72. Solicitors, Messrs. Rowland & Hutchinson, Croydon.
 - To One-fourth of a Trust Fund, value £3,500; two ladies, aged 80 and 81 respectively. Solicitors, Messrs. Farewell, Ryde, Isle of Wight.
 - To One-eighth of a Trust Fund, Consols and Freeholds and Leaseholds at Croydon and Hackney, value £6,530; also to One-thirty-second of Freeholds, value £12,000; also to One-twenty-fourth of £5,080 19s. 1d. Metropolitan Three per Cent. Stock, the whole receivable on decease of a lady aged 60. Solicitors, Messrs. Blackford, Norton, & Smith, London.
 - To One-ninth of £1,411 7s. Local Loans Stock, lady aged 65; also to One-twenty-sixth of a sum of £1,000, lady aged 76. Solicitors, Messrs. R. H. Behrend & Co., London.
 - To One-third of £3,333 6s. 8d. Consols; gentleman aged 75. Solicitors, Messrs. Upton & Brixton, London.
- LIFE INTEREST of a gentleman aged 50, in Property near Belfast, producing £211 1s. per annum, with policy. Solicitors, Messrs. White & Co., London.
- POLICIES for £1,000, £500. Solicitors, Messrs. Oldfield, Bartman, & Oldfield, and Messrs. R. H. Behrend & Co., London.
- SHARES: 40 Ordinary Shares of £1 each in National Dwellings Society (Limited). Solicitors, Messrs. Edmonds & Rutherford, London.
- (See advertisements, this week, back page.)
- Nov. 17.—Messrs. ELLIS & SON, at the Mart, at 2.—Deptford Chemical Works: Important Warehouse Premises suitable for any large manufacturing or engineering works, with Possession. Solicitors, Messrs. King, Wigg, & Co., London. (See advertisement, this week, back page.)

Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, NOV. 3.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

- BERCHINGS, LIMITED—Creditors are required forthwith to send their names and addresses to Ernest W. Gundry, 7, Gt. Winchester st. Woodham & Co, Fleet st, solors for liquidator
- HANFORD FRUIT PRESERVING CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Gregory Biddlecombe, 27, The Hundred, Romsey, Hants. Allen, Portsmouth, solors for liquidator
- HERY BRAHAM & SONS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 21, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Francis Pentland, 131, Moorbrook Park rd, Sheffield. Smith & Co, solors for liquidator
- J T BECKETT, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 27, directed to be heard at the Court House, Quay st, Manchester, on Nov 13 at 10. Hinde & Co, Manchester, for Hinde & Co, King-st, Covent Garden, solors for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Nov 11
- LONDON AND SOUTHERN COUNTRIES INVESTMENT ADVANCE AND DISCOUNT CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding-up, presented Nov 1, directed to be heard Nov 14. Goddard & Co, 8, Michael's House, St Michael's Alley, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Nov 10
- MUTTON-TURNER GUILTCROSS AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKS, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 12, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Bullimore, Norwich. Stevens & Co, Norwich, solors to liquidators
- PALMERSTON INDUSTRIAL AND FINANCE CORPORATION, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Edward Ward, 122, Carbon st
- RALPH HARRISLEY & SON, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 17, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Richard Ercoy Clark, 17, Albion st, Hanley. Challinors & Shaw, Leek, solors for liquidator
- STANDRING, DRAKE, DUNN, & CO, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Walter Lewis Engdhardt, 1A, New London st, Mark Ln
- VICTORIA MOUNT MORGAN MINING AND ORE TREATMENT CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Harold B Barham, College hill chmbrs, College hill. Mayo & Co, solors for liquidator

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, NOV. 7.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

- BRITISH ELECTRIC BIKES CO LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 8, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to G Ennor Mount, Dashwood House, 9, New Broad st
- BRITISH PIONEER ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER CO OF INDIA, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Nov 2, directed to be heard Nov 21. Riggs & Sawyer, Lincoln's inn fields, petners. Notice of appearing must be sent to reach the above-named not later than six o'clock in the afternoon of Nov 30

- GEORGE HATTERLEY & BROTHERS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 18, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Edwin Hatterley, Rose Bank, Alexandra cres. Tilley
- LONDON OPAL TILE AND DECORATIONS CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas William McDonald, 33, Nicholas Ln
- M SUMMERS & CO, LIMITED—Petn for the winding up, presented Nov 3, directed to be heard at the Court House, Government buildings, Victoria st, Liverpool, Nov 17, at 10. Quiggin & Son, Liverpool, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Nov 16
- PAUL HEATER AND CONDENSER CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Hugh Bewsey, 7, Sweeting st, Liverpool. Glittin, jun, Liverpool, solors for liquidator
- THE BRITISH COMMERCE DEVELOPMENT CO, LIMITED, OF ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors in any of the States of Australia or the Colony of New Zealand, are required, on or before Nov 28, and creditors in the United Kingdom or elsewhere on or before Dec 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Steele Esau, Victoria bldgs, Grenfell st, Adelaide, South Australia

Creditors' Notices.

Under Estates in Chancery.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, OCT. 27.

- LUCAS, JAMES, Oxford Ho'el, Marton, or Blackpool, Licensed Victualler Nov 24 Coulston v Jewitt, Registrar, Preston Butcher, Blackpool
- London Gazette.—TUESDAY, OCT. 31.
- ROOSE, EDWARD CHARLES ROBINSON, Hill st, Mayfair Dec 1 Jenks v Wells, Farwell, J Vertue, Hanover sq
- London Gazette.—FRIDAY, NOV. 3.
- CARLILE, JOHN WILLIAM, St Mary's, Wellington ter, Stockton on Tees, Roman Catholic Priest Dec 10 Attorney-General v The Treasury Solicitor, Farwell and Swinfen Eady, JJ Solicitor to the Treasury, 278, Royal Courts of Justice
- GRAHAM, ROBERT GORE, Laurel Bank, Yatton, Somerset Dec 9 Baldwin v Graham, Kekewich and Joyce, JJ Montague, Bristol
- HAMPSON, WILLIAM, Huddersfield, Stone Merchant Nov 29 Kilshaw v Hampson, Watkinson, J Freeman, Huddersfield
- MAGEE, JOHN JAMES, 81, Avenue Victor Hugo, Paris Jan 15 Magee v Magee, Kekewich, J Rubinstein & Co, Raymond bldg, Gray's Inn
- MAGEE, JEREMY MARIE BROOKS, 81, Avenue Victor Hugo, Paris Jan 15 Magee v Magee, Kekewich, J Rubinstein & Co, Raymond bldg, Gray's Inn
- TRENNERT, JOHN, High st, Bristol, Wholesale Hoiler Dec 8 Trenerry v Trenerry, Kekewich and Joyce, JJ Barry, Bristol

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, OCT. 27.

- ALLPREES, Capt WILLIAM AGUILAR, South Eaton pl Nov 18 Lumley & Lumley, Conduit st, Bond st
- ATWOOD, Rev ARTHUR THOMAS, Bromeswell, Suffolk Nov 30 Atwood, Bishopstrow Rectory, Warminster
- BATLEY, JOHN, Merton, Surrey, Nov 25 Whitehouse & Co, Queen st
- BETHUNE, ABRAHAM RICHARD, East Grinstead Nov 24 Buss, Tunbridge Wells
- BLAKEBOURNE, HENRY EDWARD Scarborough Nov 28 Watts & Co, Scarborough
- BROOKS-LAURE, WILLIAM, Southport, Lancs, Bank Clerk Nov 10 Brown & Co, Southport
- BURBIDGE, HENRY, Westgate on Sea, Kent, Nursery Gardener Dec 9 Reece, Westgate on Sea
- CORVAIA, BARONDESS IRENE, Alexandra Villas, Finsbury Park Dec 8 Ponsford & Devenish, Walbrook
- CORY, DANIEL, Frithelsto k, Devon Dec 19 Bazeley & Co, Bideford, N Devon
- CURRY, WILLIAM, Tooting Park, North Finchley Dec 11 King & Co, Cannon st
- CURTIS, THOMAS KING, Brackley, Northampton, Draper Dec 8 Collyer-Bristow & Co, Bedford row
- EDWARDS, EDWARD TICKNER, Overhill rd, Dulwich Dec 8 Biddle & Co, Aldermanbury
- FOLLEY, WILLIAM, Bideford, Devon, Dairyman Dec 19 Bazeley & Co, Bideford, North Devon
- FOLLEY, KUSANNA, Bideford, Devon Dec 19 Bazeley & Co, Bideford, North Devon
- FROST, ELIZA, Tunstall, S affs, Grocer Nov 17 Ho'inshead, Tunstall
- GADIE, ANNE, Scarborough Nov 28 Watts & Co, Scarborough
- GLAVES, ELIZABETH, Scarborough Dec 4 W & S Drawbridge, Scarborough
- GRAHAM, JAMES, Wimbledon Dec 30 Crawford & Lockhart, Belfast
- GUNTON, ELLEN, Thorpe Hamlet, Norwich Jan 26 Stevens & Co, Norwich
- HAYES, THOMAS, Tunstall, Staffs, Licensed Victualler Nov 28 Llewellyn & Son, Tunstall
- HILTON, WILLIAM HUGHES, Sale, Chester Jan 1 Withington & Co, Manchester
- HOLDEN, JABEZ, Darwen, Lancs Dec 2 Marsden & Marsden, Blackburn
- HUDSON, HERBERT, Birmingham, Hour Glass Manufacturer Nov 25 Walthall, Birmingham
- JAMES JAMES, Weston under Penyard, Hereford, Farmer Dec 8 Williams & Treedy, Monmouth
- JOHNSON, WILLIAM GEORGE, Scarborough Nov 28 Watts & Co, Scarborough
- JONES, EDWARD GILLIAT, JP, Bala Dec 11 Rivington & Son, Fenchurch bldgs
- KENDALL, THOMAS, Looe, Lanes, Yeoman Dec 1 Haddelsey, Gt Grimsey
- KITCHIN, JOSEPH, Glenties rd, Westcombe Park, Merchant Dec 3 Worrell & Son, Colemans
- LEE, EMILY, Hartogate Nov 25 Vickers & Co, Sheffield
- LUCAS, FRANCES, Hove, Sussex Nov 30 Wright & Co, Liverpool
- LEIGH, ALFRED OVERTON, Gresham House Nov 29 Cambliss & Davenport, Chancery Ln
- MARSHALL, GEORGE JOHN, Temple Ewell, nr Dover, Butcher Dec 1 E & A Elvins, Dover
- MUMFORD, SUSANNAH, Frinton on Sea, Essex Nov 29 Grimwade & Son, Hallsleigh, Suffolk
- NORMAN, SEPTIMIUS, Penrith, Monumental Mason Nov 15 Ainslie & Co, Penrith
- PEAKE, MARY CROSS, Burrough on the Hill, Melton Mowbray Nov 30 Peak & Co, Bedford row
- PIDD, ELIZABETH ANN, Crowle, Lincs Nov 27 Burtonshaw & Cundall, Crowle, nr Doncaster
- RANKIN, ELIZABETH, Birmingham Nov 20 Dixon, Birmingham
- RICHARDS, HOWELL, Glynneth, Glam, Hotel Keeper Nov 30 Williams, North
- ROBINSON, JOSEPH, Fairfield Crank, nr St Helens, Lancs Nov 30 Brown & Sons, St Helens
- SANDERSON, MARY, Rochdale Nov 15 Wales & Thompson, Rochdale
- SMITH, SARAH, Leyham Dec 14 Taylor & Taylor, New Broad st
- STANDEN, CHARLOTTE, Tickhurst, Sussex Nov 24 Buss, Tunbridge Wells
- TOWNSEND, JOSEPH, Almsdale, Lancs Dec 1 Mawchley & Hatfield, Southport
- TRUETT, SARAH, Cullompton, Devon Nov 27 Mitchell, Wellington, Somerset
- VAUGHAN, EDWIN, Green lanes, Finsbury Park, Packing Case Maker Dec 14 Giddins, Sherborn Ln
- WAT, WILLIAM CORNELL, Newcastle upon Tyne, Artist Nov 25 Eking & Wyles, Nottingham
- WOOD, RICHARD, Tooting Dec 1 Corbould-Ellis & Mitchell, Clement's Ln
- WOOLLEY, THOMAS, Lifford Dec 6 Peake & Co, Bedford row

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 31.

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED AND PETITION DISMISSED.

HUNT, WILLIAM GEORGE, Great College st, Camden Town. Grocer High Court Pet April 12 Ord April 18 Recd Rec Ord and Petn Dis Sept 13

FIRST MEETINGS.

AIRRY, ROBERT, Blackbun, Painter Nov 8 at 11.30 County Court house, Blackburn

BELL, JOHN, Haltwhistle, Northumberland, Bootmaker Nov 13 at 12 Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle

BRICE, ROBERT WILLIAM BUSSON, Theale, Somerset, Grocer Nov 8 at 11.45 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol

BROWN, ROBERT, Town Bottom, Kirkheaton, nr Huddersfield, Joiner Nov 9 at 3.30 Off Rec, Prudential bldg, New st, Huddersfield

BUSH, LEOPOLD EDWARD, Ascot, Fishmonger Nov 9 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge

CRANE, WALTER HEATON, Small Heath, Birmingham, Factor Nov 9 at 11.19, Corporation st, Birmingham

CULLMORE, LYDIA, Coleford, Glos, Wine Merchant Nov 8 at 12 Off Rec, Westgate chambers, Newport, Mon

DANDO, SMON, Dudley, Worcester, Charter Master Nov 10 at 11.30 Off Rec, 199, Wolverhampton st, Dudley

DAVISON, WILLIAM, Binchester Blocks, nr Bishop Auckland, Durham, Miner Nov 8 at 3 Off Rec, 3, Manor pl, Sunderland

DIBDEN, WILLIAM, Chelmsford, Hairdresser Nov 10 at 3.14, Bedford row

FLECKNOE, EMILY ANN, Weston super Mare, Lodging house Keeper Nov 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, 23, Baldwin st, Bristol

GRUNDY, JOHN PERCY, Bolton, Grocer Nov 10 at 11.19, Exchange st, Bolton

HAINES, ALLEN LANCASTER FARMER, and JAMES CHARLES FARMER HAINES, Birmingham, Fruit Salesmen Nov 9 at 12.19, Corporation st, Birmingham

HAYVERGROFT, GEORGE WILLIAM, jun, Kingston upon Hull, Engineer Nov 8 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House, Hull

HEALD, JOSEPH, Cardiff, Wagon Builders Nov 8 at 3 Park Hotel, Cardiff

HINGLEY, JOHN, Hill, nr Halesowen, Worcester, Grocer Nov 8 at 11 Off Rec, 199, Wolverhampton st, Dudley

HIRST, STOCKS, Mirfield, Yorks, Tailor Nov 8 at 10.30 Off Rec, Bank chambers, Corporation st, Dewsbury

HUNTER, HENRY, Bath Nov 8 at 12 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol

JAGIELSKI, VICTOR APOLLINARIS, Dorset sq, Doctor Nov 13 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

JEFFERIES, CHARLES ALBERT, Burton on Trent, Tailor Nov 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby

JONES, DAVID THOMAS, Llandilo, Carmarthen, Grocer Nov 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

LEACH, ALBERT OLIVER, Widnes, Shipbroker Nov 8 at 13 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool

LEWIS, CHARLES, Seacombe, Chester, Builder Nov 8 at 2.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool

LINDSELL, CHARLES FREDERICK, South Molton, Devon Nov 14 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

LITE, FRANK, Martock, Somerset, Innkeeper Nov 10 at 2.30 Off Rec, City chambers, Catherine st, Salisbury

MASON, CECIL MARCH, St Malo, France Nov 8 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

MATTHEW, GEORGE, Malton, Yorks, Paper Dealer Nov 8 at 5.74, Newborough, Scarborough

MATTHEW, ELIZABETH, Leadenhall st, Jewell Nov 8 at 12.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

MOORE, PERCY, Ayvalide rd, Peckham, Grocer Nov 8 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

MURRAY, DAVID ALEXANDER BRUCE, Gt St Helen's, Shipbroker Nov 8 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

NEDDOFF, BARNETT, Cheetham, Manchester, Tailor's Machinist Nov 8 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

NORRIS & Co, A, Queen Victoria st, Stock Dealers Nov 13 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

PARKER, ROBERT WILLIAM, New London st, Solicitor Nov 10 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

PARRY, GEORGE, West Bromwich, Baker Nov 8 at 11.19, Corporation st, Birmingham

PUTTICK, HARRY, Worthing, Carpenter Nov 9 at 10.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldg, Brighton

REEVES, WALTER JAMES, Bradford, Butcher Nov 10 at 3 Off Rec, 29, Tyttel st, Bradford

RENNIE, MARTHA, Lincoln, Licensed Victualler Nov 10 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Silver st, Lincoln

ROBERTS, JOHN THOMAS, Penyarden, Ruabon, Denbigh, Model Maker Nov 8 at 12 Crypt chambers, Eastgate row, Chester

ROWLEY, C. Gt Winchester st, Accountant Nov 9 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

SCOTT, SYDNEY, Leicestershire, Tailor Nov 8 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Herriage st, Leicester

SHARP, HENRY BRADLEY, South Bank, York, Butcher Nov 10 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough

SIMMONS, JAMES WILLIAM, Kirkley, Suffolk, Smack Master Nov 8 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich

SKINNER, WALTER HENRY, HERBERT WILLIAM SKINNER, and FRANK ELI SKINNER, Melksham, Wilts, Builders Nov 8 at 12.15 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol

SMITH, A. M. Fleet st, Builder Nov 10 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

SPINKS, ERNEST WILLIAM, Brandon, Suffolk, Butcher Nov 11 at 12.30 Off Rec, 5, King st, Norwich

STEPHENS, WILLIAM CHARLES, Southend on Sea, Builder Nov 10 at 12.14, Bedford row

TENKINS, LEWIS G, Blomfield st Nov 9 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

THOMPSON, BENJAMIN, Laytonstone, Builder Nov 9 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

THOMPSON, MATTHEW HENRY, Quarry Bank, Staffs, Shacklesmith Nov 10 at 11 Off Rec, 199, Wolverhampton st, Dudley

VAUX, JOE, Dowlish Wake, Somerset, Baker Nov 11 at 12.30 10, Hammet st, Taunton

WALKER, HERBERT, Bolton, Tin Plate Worker Nov 10 at 3.19 Exchange st, Bolton

WHITTINGHAM, ROBERT, Brimston, Staffs, Farmer Nov 6 at 11 Swan Hotel, Stafford

WILD, JOHN, Mistoron, Staffs, Plumber Nov 16 at 12.30 Off Rec, 31, Silver st, Lincoln

WILLETT, CHARLES EDWARD, Moldgreen, Huddersfield, Insurance Superintendent Nov 9 at 3 Off Rec, Prudential bldg, New st, Huddersfield

WOODINGS, WILLIAM, HM Prison, Wandsworth, Insurance Agent Nov 9 at 12.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge

WOOLF, HARRIS, Leman st, Whitechapel, Builder Nov 10 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

WONCOTER, JOHN FULLER, Stratford, Florist Nov 8 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

ADJUDICATIONS.

BIRCH, WILLIAM HENRY, Morecambe, Traveller Preston Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

BIRD, SIDNEY JAMES, Walsall, Cycle Manufacturer Walsall Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

BIRD, HERBERT HARRY, Stockwell, Fishmonger High Court Pet Sept 18 Ord Oct 25

BRICE, ROBERT WILLIAM BUSSON, Theale, Somerset, Grocer Wells Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

BRIGGS, ROBERT BAKERWELL, and HERBERT ROBERT BRIGGS, Stepney, Cork Merchants High Court Pet Sept 23 Ord Oct 24

BROWN, ROBERT, Kirkheaton, nr Huddersfield, Joiner Huddersfield Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

BROWN, WILLIAM LEWIS, and SAMUEL YARNHAM BROWN, Salisbury, Builders, Merchants Salisbury Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

CALVERT, JAMES HAWORTH, Fore st, Calico Printer High Court Pet July 22 Ord Oct 26

CHANDLER, JAMES GEORGE, Denmark park, Peckham High Court Pet July 22 Ord Oct 24

CLARE, GEORGE, Northampton, Grocer Northampton Pet Sept 23 Ord Oct 26

DUCKHAM, JAMES HENRY, Tuckingmill, Camborne, Cornwall, Licensed Hawker Truro Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

FERRIS, ALBERT ARTHUR, Bromley, Publican Croydon Pet Sept 13 Ord Oct 27

FIELDING, CHARLES, Whitfield Cross, Glossop, Derby, Builder Ashton under Lyne Pet Oct 23 Ord Oct 27

FLECKNOE, EMILY ANN, Weston super Mare, Somerset, Boarding house Keeper Bridgewater Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 27

FOX, ARTHUR WALTER, Gt Yarmouth, Painter Gt Yarmouth Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

GALBRAITH, THOMAS, Petherton rd, Canonbury, Physician High Court Pet Sept 19 Ord Oct 26

GRUNDY, JOHN PERCY, Bolton, Grocer Bolton Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

HATCHMAN, HARRY, and WILLIAM THOMAS BENNETT, St Leonards, Sussex, Caterers Hastings Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

HUMBER, JESSE, Leicester, Fancy Goods Dealer Leicester Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

JEFFERY, CHRISTOPHER, Lowestoft, Suffolk, General Shopkeeper Gt Yarmouth Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

JOHNSON, WILLIAM THOMAS, Willenhall, Staffs, Carpenter Wolverhampton Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

JONES, DAVID THOMAS, Llandilo, Carmarthen, Grocer Carmarthen Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

KENT, JOHN, Burton on Trent, Baker Burton on Trent Ord Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

LANLEY, WILLIAM, Tamworth, Staffs, Fruiterer Birmingham Pet Oct 24 Ord Oct 27

LEHMANN, HENRY, Fawley rd, Hampstead High Court Pet Aug 24 Ord Oct 21

LEVETT, BERTIE GEORGE, Brandon, Suffolk, Carrier Ipswich Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

LOGGOTT, HAMILTON, Birmingham, Provision Dealer Birmingham Pet Sept 21 Ord Oct 23

MCCUMPHIA, ANTHONY, Leicester, Draper's Traveller Leicester Pet Oct 23 Ord Oct 26

MCCREA, HUGH, Stafford, Clerk Stafford Pet Oct 24 Ord Oct 23

MCKAY, JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, Sunderland, Plumber Sunderland Pet Oct 24 Ord Oct 24

MASTERMAN, GEORGE, Malton, York, Paper Dealer Scarborough Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

MATTHEW, ELIZABETH, Leadenhall st, Jeweller High Court Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

MELSON, CHARLES HENRY, Llandudno, Solicitor Bristol Pet Aug 31 Ord Oct 26

MILLER, ABRAHAM, Teesdale st, Hackney, Boot Manufacturer High Court Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 26

MORRIS, THOMAS, Blaenwylf, Glam, Collier Neath and Aberavon Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

NEDDOFF, BARNETT, Cheetham, Manchester, Tailor's Machinist Manchester Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

OSNEY, CHARLES GORTON, Surbiton, Commercial Traveller Kingston, Surrey Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

PAINTHORPE, JOHN, Cliftonville, Margate, Hotel Proprietor Canterbury Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

PATRICK, SIMON, Plymouth, Baker Plymouth Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

PETER, EDWARD EDWIN, Yelverton, Devon Plymouth Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

PETTICK, HARRY, Worthing, Carpenter Brighton Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

REEVES, WALTER JAMES, Bradford, Butcher Bradford Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

ROWLES, JAMES, Haydon, Stalybridge, Chester, Beer-seller Ashton under Lyne Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

RUSSELL, THOMAS JAMES, Peterborough, Horse Dealer Peterborough Pet Oct 23 Ord Oct 23

SCOTT, WALTER STANLEY, South Shields, Chemist Newcastle-on-Tyne Pet Sept 14 Ord Oct 26

SHARP, HENRY BRADLEY, South Bank, Butcher Middlesbrough Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

STEVENS, HENRY, Mark in High Court Pet Aug 23 Ord Oct 25

THOMPSON, MATTHEW HENRY, Quarry Bank, Staffs, Shacklesmith Stourbridge Pet Oct 23 Ord Oct 23

TINDALL, SIDNEY MAGUIRE, Leeds, Insurance Manager Leeds Pet Aug 1 Ord Oct 25

WALKER, HERBERT, Bolton, Tin Plate Worker Bolton Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

WEST, WILLIAM THOMAS, Kettering, Hay Dealer Northampton Pet Oct 26 Ord Oct 26

WILLETT, CHARLES EDWARD, Moldgreen, Huddersfield, Insurance Superintendent Huddersfield Pet Sept 8 Ord Oct 26

WILLIAMS, FANNY, Gloucester, Innkeeper Gloucester Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 27

WOLFF, JACOB, Gibson sq, Islington, Cigar Merchant High Court Pet Sept 11 Ord Oct 26

YOUNG, CHARLES HENRY, Grange-town, Cardiff, Baker Cardiff Pet Oct 25 Ord Oct 25

ADJUDICATIONS ANNULLED AND RECEIVING ORDERS RESCINDED.

ELLIOTT, WALTER KITH, Cromwell rd, South Kensington High Court Rec Ord June 20, 1902 Adjud Aug 1, 1902 Rec and Annul Oct 27

HASTINGS, CHARLES HOLLAND, Grosvenor st High Court Rec Ord Nov 25, 1904 Adjud Dec 23, 1904 Annul Oct 27

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Nov. 3

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ABBOTT, WILLIAM MORRILL, Heanor, Derby, Fancy Draper Derby Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

ALISON, GARDNER, & Co, Chancery ln, Stock Brokers High Court Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 30

ALLEN, CHARLES, Derby, Butcher Derby Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 1

ALLEN, EDWIN, East Southsea, Hants Portsmouth Pet Aug 19 Ord Oct 30

BIBBY, JOSEPH EDWARD, Rhyl, Flint, Stationer Bangor Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

BLEWITT, ALBERT, Newton Abbot, Devon, Tobaccoist High Court Pet Oct 2 Ord Oct 31

BLINKHORN, GEORGE, Bramhope, nr Leeds Leeds Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

BRECKTON, SAMUEL WILLIAM, Liverpool, Estate Agent Liverpool Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 31

BROOKS, JOSEPH, Porth, Glam, Greengrocer Pontypridd Pet Oct 19 Ord Oct 31

BURKITT, WILL, Kingston upon Hull, Contractor Kingston upon Hull Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

CHARLES, THOMAS FREDERICK, Waddingham, Lincs, Builder Lincoln Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

CROWTHER, DANIEL, Burnley, Leeds Leeds Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 1

DAVENPORT, JOHN MASON, Hough Green, Lanes, Machinist Liverpool Pet Sept 16 Ord Oct 30

DEANE, ALBERT GEORGE, Reading, House Decorator Reading Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

DUFFY, ANTHONY, Dalton, Upholsterer High Court Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

DYER, CARVEY, and SYDNEY ARTHUR, Blaina, Newport, Plumbers Newport, Mon Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

EARDLEY, ERNEST JUSTICE STANBURY, Birmingham, Solicitor Birmingham Pet Aug 31 Ord Oct 30

ESPLEY, WALTER, Bayston Hill, Salop Shrewsbury Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 30

EVANS, HARRY JAMES EATON, Avallennau, Pembroke Pembroke Dock Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

GIBSON, HARRY, Prescott, Lancs, Grocer Liverpool Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

GRIFFITH, WILLIAM LEWIS, Blaenau Ffestiniog, Merioneth, Quaternary Portmadoes Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

GROFF, CHARLES, Portsmouth, Hairdresser Portsmouth Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

HALL, ELIZABETH, Knarborough, Secondhand Furniture Dealer York Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 30

HALLAM, SAMUEL ROBINSON, Old Kent rd, Surgeon High Court Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

HARPER, HERBERT, Littlehampton, Schoolmaster Brighton Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

JONES, WILLIAM, Barmouth, Merioneth, Saddler Aberystwyth Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 1

KORHNE, HENRY, Friars Barnet, Restaurant Keeper High Court Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

LEACH, ALBERT WESTBROOKE, Norwich, Baker Norwich Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

MANFORD, EDWARD, Weston, nr Oswestry, Salop, Farmer Wrexham Pet Oct 23 Ord Oct 23

MORLEY, GEORGE WALLACE, Hadleigh, Suffolk Ipswich Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

MORRIS, SAMUEL, Kidderminster, Cabinet Maker Kidderminster Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

NUTT, WALTER PERCIVAL, Leytonstone, Warehouseman High Court Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

PHILLIPS, WILLIAM, Neyland, Fruiterer Pembroke Dock Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

PICK, H. J, Leadenhall st High Court Pet Aug 26 Ord Nov 1

POOLS, GEORGE, Northwich, Baker Crews Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

PRICE & Co, C. B. Church st, Paddington Green, Cabinet Makers Court of Appeal Pet Sept 16 Ord Oct 4

PURMAN, JOHN, Pontardawe, Glam, Tailor Aberavon Pet Oct 21 Ord Nov 1

REDDER, HERBERT, Leeds, Tailors' Cutter Leeds Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

RICHARDS, RICHARD, Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

SAMPSON, WILLIAM, Pet Sept 23 Ord Oct 26

SMALLWOOD, MARY, wish, Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

SMITH, EDWIN, E. Wells Pet Oct 27 Ord Oct 27

SMITH, WILLIAM, Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

STEVENS, CHARLES, land, Auction Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

VOSS, ARTHUR, THOMAS, Marchant's T Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

WALSHAW, JOHN, facturer H Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

WEATON, ELIZABETH, York, M Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

WEATON, WILLIAM, Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

WOOLF, JOSEPH, Manchester Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

ALISON, GARDNER, 15 at 11 Rec, Cambr

ALLEN, EDWIN, Rec, Cambr

BLINKHORN, GEORGE, Off Rec, 22

CLARE, GEORGE, Off Rec, 22

DUFOFF, ABRAHAM, Nov 14 at 2

DUCKHAM, JAMES, wall, Lices

ESPLEY, WALTER, Rec, 42, 8

GHELOOLD, AL, Architect

GIBSON, HARRY, 35, Victoria

GROVES, CHARLES, Off Rec, Ca

HALL, ELIZABETH, Dealer, No

HUMBER, JESSE, 12 Off Rec

INWARDS, CHAR, Nov 15 at

LANE, WALTER, 47, Full st

LEVETT, BERT, Nov 17 at 3

LOYD, WILLIAM, 12 CRYST

LOVE, JOHN D, 11.15 Off

LOVE, THOMAS, 14 at 11 C

MCCUMPHIA, J, 13 at 3 C

MAR

RICHINGS, RICHARD, Sheriton, Wilts, Hawker Swindon Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
GARFON, WILLIAM, Watford, Herts, Builder St Albans Pet Sept 25 Ord Oct 31
SMALLWOOD, MARGARET, Oldbury, Worcester West Bromwich Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
SMITH, EDWIN, Edmestridge, Kent, Contractor Tunbridge Wells Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
SMITH, WILLIAM, Ormskirk, Tripe Dresser Liverpool Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
SPENCER, CHARLES ALFRED, and JOHN ARMSTRONG, Sunderland, Auctioneers Sunderland Pet Sept 25 Ord Oct 30
VOSS, ARTHUR, Coventry Coventry Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 1
TAYLOR, THOMAS ALFRED, Sparkhill, Worcester, Coal Merchant's Traveller Birmingham Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
WALSHAW, JOHN WILLIAM, Halifax, Mineral Water Manufacturer Halifax Pet Oct 2 Ord Oct 30
WHARTON, ELIZA, Hartogate, Lodging House Keeper York Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
WHARTON, WILLIAM, Hartogate, Cab Proprietor York Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
WOOL, JOSEPH, Higher Broughton, Manchester, Auctioneer Manchester Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 30

FIRST MEETINGS.

ALISON, GARDNER, & Co, Chancery Ln, Stock Brokers Nov 15 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at
ALLEN, EDWIN, East Southsea, Hants Nov 13 at 4 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth
BLISHMORE, GEORGE, Bramhope, nr Leeds Nov 13 at 11.30 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
CLARE, GEORGE, Northampton, Grocer Nov 13 at 11.30 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton
DUBOFF, ABRAHAM, Sandringham rd, Dalton, Upholsterer Nov 14 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at
DUCKHAM, JAMES HENRY, Tuckingsmill, Camborne, Cornwall, Licensed Hawker Nov 11 at 12 Off Rec, Bowcaven st, Truro
EMLEY, WALTER, Bayston Hill, Salop Nov 11 at 11 Off Rec, 42, St John's hill, Shrewsbury
GENSLWOOD, ALBERT LIVERSEY, Cherryhinton, Cambridge, Architect Nov 13 at 12 Off Rec, 5, Petty Cury, Cambridge
GIBSON, HARRY, Prescott, Grocer Nov 13 at 2.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
GROVES, CHARLES, Portsmouth, Tobacconist Nov 13 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth
HALL, ELIZABETH, Knarborough, Secondhand Furniture Dealer Nov 13 at 3.30 Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe pl, York
HUBBER, JESSIE, Leicester, Fancy Goods Dealer Nov 13 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
LEWIS, CHARLES PERCY, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer Nov 15 at 12 Chamber of Commerce, 53, George st, Luton
LANE, WALTER, Derby, Dairyman Nov 11 at 11 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby
LAVETT, BERTRAM GEORGE, Brandeston, Suffolk, Carrier Nov 17 at 2.15 Off Rec, 36, Princes st, Ipswich
LLOYD, WILLIAM HENRY, Connah's Quay, Flint Nov 13 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
LEWIS, JOHN, Denshaw, nr Delph, Yorks, Carrier Nov 14 at 11.15 Off Rec, Groves st, Oldham
LEWIS, THOMAS, Denshaw, nr Delph, Yorks, Farmer Nov 14 at 11 Off Rec, Groves st, Oldham
MCCUMPHAY, ANTHONY, Leicester, Draper's Traveller Nov 13 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
MARON, ARTHUR EDWARD, Nottingham Nov 14 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
MORLEY, GEORGE WALLACE, Hadleigh, Suffolk Nov 17 at 12.30 Off Rec, 36, Princes st, Ipswich
NORTH, JOSEPH, Hyson Green, Nottingham, Carriage Builder Nov 15 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
ORRISTON, C, Twickenham Nov 13 at 12 Off Rec, 14, Bedford row
PACKWOOD, WILLIAM, Wollaston, Northampton, Draper Nov 13 at 12.30 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton
PAULING, JOHN, Cliftonville, Margate, Hotel Proprietor Nov 11 at 12 Endcliffe Hall Hotel, Cliftonville, Margate
PEAR, HENRY, East Challow, Berks, Farmer Nov 11 at 12 1, 25 Aldgate, Oxford
PICK, H J, Leadenhall st Nov 13 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at
RHODES, HERBERT, Leeds, Tailors' Cutter Nov 13 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
REED, GEORGE, Maidenhead, Domestic Machinery Dealer Nov 13 at 3 14, Bedford row
ROWLES, JAMES, Heyrod, Stalybridge, Beerseller Nov 11 at 11.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
ROXAN, ERNEST WILLIAM, Cranleigh, Surrey, Cycle Dealer Nov 14 at 12.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge
TIPPETT, WILLIAM HENRY, and SAMUEL FREEMAN, Manchester, Material Dealers Nov 11 at 11 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
TERRELL, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Grocer Nov 16 at 12 Off Rec, Fletree ln, Sheffield
WALKER, WILLIAM MARGON, Margate, Private Hotel Proprietor Nov 11 at 12.30 Endcliffe Hall Hotel, Cliftonville, Margate
WELCH, FREDERICK, Cheltenham, Greengrocer Nov 11 at 2.45 County Court bldg, Cheltenham
WEST, WILLIAM THOMAS, Kettering, Northampton, Hay Dealer Nov 13 at 12 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton
WHARTON, ELIZA, Hartogate, Lodging house Keeper Nov 13 at 3 Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe pl, York
WHOLESWORTH, JOSEPH EDWARD, Burnley, Lancs, Grocer Nov 13 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Chapel st, Preston
WILLIAMS, FANEY, Gloucester, Innkeeper Nov 11 at 12 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester
WHARTON, WILLIAM, Hartogate, Cab Proprietor Nov 15 at 2.30 Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe pl, York

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Oct 31:

BELL, JOHN, Westgate, Halthwistle, Northumberland, Bootmaker Nov 13 at 12 Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle

ADJUDICATIONS.

ALLEN, CHARLES, Derby, Butcher Derby Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 1
BIBBY, JOSEPH EDWARD, Rhyl, Flint, Stationer Bangor Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
BLISHMORE, GEORGE, Bramhope, nr Leeds Leeds Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
BRETT, RALPH, Gateshead, Butcher Newcastle on Tyne Pet Oct 2 Ord Oct 30
BURKITT, WILL, Kingston upon Hull, Contractor Kingston upon Hull Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
CHARLES, THOMAS FREDERICK, Waddingham, Lincs, Builder Lincoln Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
CLANCY, TERENCE, Peckham Rye, Clerk High Court Pet Aug 31 Ord Oct 30
COLLINS, LOUIS NAPOLEON, Norton rd, Uxbridge High Court Pet Aug 14 Ord Oct 30
CROWTHER, DANIEL, Burley, Leeds Leeds Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 1
DEANE, ALBERT GEORGE, Reading, House Decorator Reading Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
DONAT, ERNEST EMIL, Withington, Manchester, Mechanical Engineer Manchester Pet Aug 31 Ord Oct 31
DUBOFF, ABRAHAM, Dalton, Upholsterer High Court Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
DYER, CAREY, and SYDNEY ARTHUR, Blaina, Mon, Plumbers Newport, Mon Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
EDWARDS, ALEXANDER GEORGE, Rustington, Sussex High Court Pet May 31 Ord Oct 29
ELLIS, WILLIAM, jun, Lavender hill, Clapham Junction, House Agent Wandsworth Pet Sept 15 Ord Oct 31
EMLEY, WALTER, Bayston Hill, Salop Shrewsbury Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 31
EVANS, HARRY JAMES EATON, Avenall, Pembroke Pembroke Dock Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
GIBSON, HARRY, Prescott, Lancs, Grocer Liverpool Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
GRIFFITH, WILLIAM LEWIS, Blaenau Ffestiniog, Merioneth, Quarryman Portmadoc Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
GROVES, CHARLES, Portsmouth, Hairdresser Portsmouth Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
HALL, ELIZABETH, Knarborough, Secondhand Furniture Dealer York Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
HALLAM, SAMUEL ROBINSON, Old Kent rd, Surgeon High Court Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
HEALD, JOSEPH, East Moor, Cardiff, Wagon Builders Cardiff Pet Oct 21 Ord Oct 28
JONES, WILLIAM, Baymouth, Merioneth, Saddler Aberystwyth Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 1
KOHLER, HENRY, Beaconsfield rd, Friern Barnet, Restaurant Keeper High Court Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
LERGE, ALBERT WESTBROOKE, Norwich, Baker Norwich Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
LLOYD, WILLIAM HENRY, Connah's Quay, Flint Chester Pet Oct 2 Ord Oct 30
LYE, FRANK, Martock, Somerset, Innkeeper Yeovil Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 30
MANSFORD, EDWARD, Weston, nr Oswestry, Salop, Farmer Wrexham Pet Oct 28 Ord Oct 28
MORRIS, SAMUEL, Kidderminster, Cabinet Maker Kidderminster Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
NUTT, WALTER PERCIVAL, Leytonstone, Warehouseman High Court Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
PHILLIPS, WILLIAM, Neyland, Fruiterer Pembroke Dock Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
POOLE, GEORGE, Northwich, Baker Crewe Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
READ, ELIZA, Woodford Wells, Essex, Coach Builder High Court Pet Sept 6 Ord Oct 30
REED, CHARLES, sen, and CHARLES REED, jun, Darby End, Dudley, Worcester, Coal Merchants Dudley Pet Sept 20 Ord Nov 1
RHODES, HERBERT, Leeds, Tailors' Cutter Leeds Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
RICHINGS, RICHARD, Sheriton, Wilts, Hawker Swindon Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
SMALLWOOD, MARGARET, Tat Bank, Oldbury, Worcester West Bromwich Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31
SMITH, GEORGE, Eton, Bucks, Tailor Windsor Pet Sept 7 Ord Oct 28
SMITH, WILLIAM, Ormskirk, Tripe Dresser Liverpool Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
TIPPETT, WILLIAM HENRY, and SAMUEL FREEMAN, Manchester, Watch Material Dealers Manchester Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 30
TOWNSON, CHARLES GALTON, Deal, Kent, Builder Canterbury Pet Sept 5 Ord Oct 28
VOSS, ARTHUR, Coventry Coventry Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 1
WAUGH, ROBERT DENHOLM CARLAK, Forest Gate, Fish Salesman High Court Pet Oct 25 Ord Oct 30
WHARTON, ELIZA, Hartogate, Lodging house Keeper York Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30
WHARTON, WILLIAM, Hartogate, Cab Proprietor York Pet Oct 30 Ord Oct 30

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Oct 20:

SIMMONDS, ERNEST ALFRED FORBES, Isleworth, Middlesex, Dairyman Brentford Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 27

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

KIRBY, WILLIAM ALPHRED, Scarborough, Horse Dealer Scarborough Adjud Aug 29, 1904 Annual Oct 24

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, NOV. 7.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ARCH, JOHN, Forth, Glam, Insurance Agent Pontypool Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 2

BARKER, EDWARD CHARLES, Plymouth, Coal Merchant Plymouth Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
BARREY, HENRY, Kingston upon Hull, Merchant Kingston upon Hull Pet Oct 21 Ord Nov 3
BATES, JOHN, Hedge End, Southampton, Builder Southampton Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
BATTEN, WALTER EDWARD, Bath, Grocer Bath Pet Nov 2 Ord Nov 2
CORNER, EDWARD, Bridlington, Yorks, Builder Scarborough Pet Nov 8 Ord Nov 3
DREW, WALTER, Nottingham Nottingham Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
FLANAGAN, THOMAS WILLIAM, Claydon, Derby, Grocer Chesterfield Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
GILLIATT, ROBERT JOHN, West Stockwith, Notts, Innkeeper Lincoln Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
GUEST, JOSEPH, Wolverhampton, Licensed Victualler Wolverhampton Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
HEFTONSTALL, WILLIAM, North Featherstone, Insurance Agent Wakefield Pet Nov 4 Ord Nov 4
HOWARD, HENRY ALFRED, Mount Pleasant, Swansea Swansea Pet Nov 2 Ord Nov 2
JACKSON, EDWARD, Peterborough, Commercial Traveller Peterborough Pet Nov 2 Ord Nov 2
KATTERNS, FREDERICK BROOKE, Epsom, Picture Frame Maker Crojdon Pet Nov 2 Ord Nov 2
KAY, JOHN HENRY, Southport, Boot Dealer Liverpool Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 3
KER, CHARLES JAMES INNES, Pall Mall pi High Court Pet June 6 Ord Oct 25
LEWIS, RICHARD, Aberdare, Glam, Ironfounder Aberdare Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
MADELEY, JOSEPH HENRY, Edgeley Farm, nr Whitchurch, Salop, Farmer Crewe Pet Nov 4 Ord Nov 4
MATTHEWS, FRANK HENRY, Chelworth, Suffolk, Licensed Hawker Ipswich Pet Nov 2 Ord Nov 2
MORRIS, KENNETH, Glanymann, Penger, Timberman Merthyr Tydfil Pet Nov 2 Ord Nov 2
MURRAY, JOHN BIDLEY, and WILLIAM EDWARD LAWRENCE, Choppington, Northumberland, Mineral Water Manufacturers Boston Pet Oct 21 Ord Oct 31
NETTLETON, GEORGE HOWDEN, Leeds, Joiner Leeds Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
ORME, CHARLES, Atworth, nr Melksham, Wilts, Coal Merchant Bath Pet Oct 21 Ord Nov 3
PALMER, HERBERT, Southsea, Hants, Plumber Portsmouth Pet Nov 2 Ord Nov 2
ROBERTS, HUGH THOMAS, Rhyl, Flint, Architect Bangor Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
SANDERS, GEORGE EDWARD, Biddulph, Staffs, Jeweller Hanley Pet Nov 4 Ord Nov 4
SCHRAMMCK, A, Gt Portland st, Embroiderer High Court Pet Oct 6 Ord Nov 2
WALTER, WALTER, Bedford, Shoemaker Bedford Pet Nov 4 Ord Nov 4
WELLSTED, GEORGE JOHN, Southsea, Hants, Jeweller Portsmouth Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3



Specialists in

LIBRARY BOARD ROOM OFFICE FURNITURE

Write for

"OF" Book

The "RUSSELL"
AN IDEAL TABLE FOR
BUSY MEN

Tottenham Court Road London

MAPLE & CO

WIDUPE, EPHRAIM KING, York, Grocer York Pet Nov 2
Ord Nov 2
WILLIAMS, THOMAS ALFRED, Aberdare, Green-
grocer Aberdare Pet Nov 2 Ord Nov 2
WILLIAMS, WILLIAM BATTEN, Prestatyn, Flint, Physician
Bangor Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 3
YATES, ALFRED, Bolton, Restaurant Keeper Bolton Pet
Nov 3 Ord Nov 3

Amended notice substituted for that published in
the London Gazette of Oct 31:

CHARLTON, FRANK, Walkden, nr Manchester, Cycle Dealer
Salford Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 27

Amended notice substituted for that published in the
London Gazette of Nov 3:

RICHINGS, RICHARD, Sherston, Wilts, Hawker Swindon
Pet Oct 31 Ord Oct 31

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the
SOLICITORS' JOURNAL with regularity it is
requested that application be made direct to the
Publisher, at 27, Chancery-lane.

Annual Subscriptions, WHICH MUST BE PAID
IN ADVANCE: SOLICITORS' JOURNAL and
WEEKLY REPORTER, in Wrapper, 52s.,
post-free. SOLICITORS' JOURNAL only, 28s.;
Country, 28s.; Foreign, 30s. 4d. WEEKLY
REPORTER, in Wrapper, 26s.; Country or
Foreign, 28s.

Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 9d.; half
law calf, 5s. 6d.

CITY AND COUNTY OF THE CITY OF NOTTINGHAM (to Wit).

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that the SPECIAL SESSIONS of
the Peace for the City and County of the City of Notting-
ham, will be held on THURSDAY, the 23rd day of NOVEMBER,
1905, at the Guildhall, Burton-street, in the said City, at
10.30 o'clock in the forenoon, when and where all persons
bound by recognizances to appear, or who have any business
to transact, at the said Sessions, are required to attend.
Instructions for indictments to be given to the Clerk of
the Peace not later than the Thursday preceding.
SAMUEL G. JOHNSON, Clerk of the Peace.

MR. F. F. MONTAGUE, LL.B., continues
to PREPARE for the SOLICITORS' FINAL and
INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS; payment by result.
—Particulars on application, personally or by letter, at 93,
Chancery Lane, W.

LAW.—Solicitor (23; 1st class LL.B.
London; Admitted) Requires Clerkship, preferable
with view to Partnership; General Work, but would
especially undertake Advocacy; Bristol, Bath, or district
preferred; salary not so much an object as experience and
opportunity.—LAW LIBRARIAN, Bristol.

SOLICITORS' PRACTICE for SALE; a
fortune for an Advocate.—Apply, JURIST, Box 912,
"Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

MANAGING CLERK (unadmitted) Seeks
Permanent or Temporary Engagement; 30 years'
experience without supervision; expert Settling Costs;
unexceptionable references.—ADDRESS, MANAGERS, Black-
burn House, South Lambeth-road, London, S.W.

CONVEYANCING CLERK Seeks Situa-
tion; over 20 years' wide experience in town and
country; Conveyancing, Family, and Trust business, and
could also assist in general practice; thoroughly competent
all round and of good address; unadmitted.—S. CARP
of "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

DRAUGHTSMAN, Architectural and
General.—Surveyor of experience undertakes for
Solicitors Surveys, Plans, Tracings, and Enlargements;
moderate charges.—E. A. JOLLY, 27, Doughty-street, W.C.

ABSTRACTING and all other Technical
Legal Typing quickly and accurately executed by
permanent staff.—Apply Mrs. BRIDGEMAN, 3, Salter's Hall-
court, Cannon-street, E.C.

LADY DETECTIVE, educated, experienced,
Undertakes Private and Confidential Inquiries; Divorce,
Commercial, &c.; strict integrity; moderate fees; male and
female assistants.—Miss EASTON, 241, Shaftesbury-avenue,
(two doors from) New Oxford-street.

LOANS ADVANCED, at moderate interest,
on Freeholds and long Leaseholds.—Apply, MANAGERS,
Star Life Assurance Society, 32, Moorgate-street.

THE LONDON AND WESTMINSTER
LOAN & DISCOUNT COMPANY (LTD.) (Est. 1856).
Offices: 63, St. Martin's-lane, W.C., & 43, London-wall, E.C.
ADVANCE MONEY on personal security, furniture, leases,
life policies, &c., repayable, INCLUDING INTEREST:
£10 One Year, Weekly £0 4 4 Monthly £0 19 3
£20 " " £0 8 8 " £1 17 6
£30 " " £0 12 8 " £2 16 3
£50 " " £1 1 2 " £4 13 9
£100 " " £2 4 4 " £9 7 6
Larger sums in proportion. Moderate rates for bills of
sale. Prospectus free on application to Secretary. (No
Agents.)

LAW PARTNERSHIPS & SUCCESSIONS
For Vacancies for, or introductions to the above, apply to
J. HARCOURT SMITH,
The old-established PARTNERSHIP AGENT,
LAW COSTS DRAFTSMAN, & ACCOUNTANT,
61 & 62, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.
N.B.—Vacancies for Articled Clerks. Good Mortgage
Securities Wanted.

LAW.—GREAT SAVING.—For prompt
payment 25 per cent. will be taken off the following
writing charges:—

Abstracts Copied	...	a. d.
Briefs and Drafts	...	0 8 per sheet.
Deeds Round Hand	...	2 3 per 20 folios.
Deeds Abstracted	...	0 2 per folio.
Full Copies	...	0 2 per sheet.
PAPER.—Foolscap, 1d. per sheet; Draft, 4d. ditto;		
Parchment, 1s. 6d. to 3s. 6d. per skin.		

KERR & LANHAM, 16, Fumival-street, Holborn, E.C.

TO MORTGAGEES AND OTHERS.—
Wanted, a large Block of House Property upon full
repaying lease for a term of years, with option to purchase.
—Write G. L., care of Pool's Advertising Office, Fleet-
street, E.C.

PLAISTOW (London, Tilbury, and District
Railways, about seven minutes' walk from station).—
Five double-bayed Houses, lease about 80 years at £4, let
at 12s. per week, £215 each; 30 Freehold Houses, single
bays, let at 9s. 6d. per week, £270 each; for an introduction
to immediate purchaser for the whole of this Property a
liberal commission would be paid on completion of purchase.
—Write W. E., Advertising Office, 10, High Holborn.

FREEHOLD GROUND - RENTS. — To
Trustees and others.—A Compact Parcel of about
£200 per annum, well secured on well-let Properties in
populous district N.W.; 25 years' purchase will be accepted
for whole or part.—Apply G. H. PARROTTER, 95, Finsbury-
pavement, E.C.

CLEMENT'S INN, STRAND (overlooking
the Green of the Law Courts).—Several Suites of
Magnificent OFFICES TO BE LET, containing from one
to sixteen rooms on the first floor, day and night service of
lifts, constant supply of hot water; luncheons, teas, and
dinners can be had at moderate prices; for rents and
further particulars apply to ALBERT CRUDDALL & Co.,
Clement's-inn, Strand.

TO CAPITALISTS. — £1,000 to £2,000
Required in old-established Builders, Art Decorators,
and Government Contractors' Business; 8 to 10 per cent.
per annum will be paid; capital and interest will be repaid
half-yearly, spread over a term of 5 or 10 years as desired
by lender.—Box No. 900, Office of "Solicitors' Journal,"
27, Chancery-lane, London, W.C.

MONEY.—To Solicitors.—Farrow's Bank
Limited, founded to suppress 60 per cent. usury,
Advances Money at low interest on securities which ordinary
mortgages do not accept.—Apply for particulars to
FARROW'S BANK LIMITED, 29, New Bridge-street, London,
E.C.

Daily, at 3 and 8.
MASKELYNE and DEVANT'S
MYSTERIES.
(Late Maskelyne and Cooke's.)
ST. GEORGE'S HALL, LANGHAM PLACE, W.
A Unique Entertainment.

MASCOT MOTHS.
The Talk of the Town.
Mr. David Devant, in full
g'are of the footlights, and
without aid of covers, grasps a
living woman, representing a
moth, who shrivels into
nothingness in his arms in
less than one second.
A perplexing playlet.
Who's who?
A Mystery of the air.
An uncanny Telepathic
Séance.

Enchanted Hive.
Burmese Gong.
Sylph.
Mental Magnetism.
Shades of Shifters.
Artist's Dream.
M. Gintaro.
Animated Photographs.
Mystic Kettle.

The Times says:—"A full house, full of grown-ups, with
only a sprinkling of delighted children, watch this and
other wizardries with bated breath, and laughed heartily
at Mr. David Devant's capital patter."
Reserved seats, 2s. to 5s. (children under 12 half-price);
balcony, 1s. Telephone, 1,945 Mayfair.

GENERAL REVERSIONARY AND
INVESTMENT COMPANY, Limited.
No. 26 PALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.
Established 1836, and further empowered by Special Act of
Parliament.

Share and Debenture Capital = £631,220.
REVERSIONS and LIFE POLICIES PURCHASED on favourable
terms. LOANS on REVERSIONS granted either at annual
interest or for deferred charges.
ROBERT R. TILT, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.

THE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY,
LIMITED

(ESTABLISHED 1823),
Purchase Reversionary Interests in Real and Personal
Property, and Life Interests and Life Policies, and
Advance Money upon these Securities.

Paid-up Share and Debenture Capital, £637,825.
The Society has moved from 17, King's Arms-yard to
30, COLEMAN STREET, E.C.

EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY
INTEREST SOCIETY, Limited.

10, LANCASTER PLACE, STRAND, W.C.
ESTABLISHED 1835. CAPITAL, £200,000.

Reversions and Life Interests in Landed or Funded Prop-
erty or other Securities and Annuities PURCHASED at
LOANS granted thereon.

Interest on Loans may be Capitalized.
C. H. CLAYTON, } Joint
F. H. CLAYTON, } Secretaries.

19th CENTURY BUILDING SOCIETY,

ADELAIDE PLACE, LONDON BRIDGE, E.C.
Assets " " " £162,000.

CHAIRMAN
SIR HENRY WALDEMAR LAWRENCE, BART., J.P.,
2, Mitre-court-buildings, Temple, E.C.

Prompt and Liberal Advances to Purchase, Build, or
Improve Freehold, Leasehold, or Copyhold Property.
Borrowers Interest 4 per cent. Monthly repayments,
which include Principal, Premium, and Interest for each
£100: 10 years, £1 1s. 1d.; 12 years, 18s. 4d.; 15 years, 15s. 6d.
18 years, 14s. 2d.; 21 years, 12s. 11d. Survey Fee to £500
half-a-guinea.

Prospectus free of FREDERICK LONG, Manager

ROYAL ITALIAN CIRCUS ("Hengler's"),
10 Oxford-circus, W.—DAILY, at 3 and 8. Over 300
PERFORMING ANIMALS. Prices from 6d. Children
half-price. Box-office 10 to 10. Tel. 4,138, Gerrard.
JUMBO JUNIOR, Society's latest pet, "At Home" Daily,
at 3 and 8.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.
LIFELIKE PORTRAIT MODELS OF
THE LATE SIR HENRY IRVING,
THE LATE DR. T. J. BARNABO.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S BOHEMIAN BAND.
Admission, 1s. Children under 12, 6d. Open 10 till 11.

ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY'S GARDENS,
Regent's Park, are OPEN DAILY (except Sundays),
from 9 a.m. until sunset. Admission 1s. Mondays 6d.
Children always 6d. Ladies or gentlemen may be elected
Fellows of the Society. Entrance fee 25. Annual sub-
scription £3, or composition fee £35.—For particulars apply
to the SECRETARY, 3, Hanover-square, W.

BRAND'S
ESSENCE

OF
BEEF,

ALSO OF
CHICKEN, MUTTON, and VEAL,
FOR
INVALIDS.

Price Lists of Invalid Preparations free on
application to

BRAND & CO., LTD., MAYFAIR, W.

An admirable Food of the

EPPS'S

Finest quality and flavour.

COCOA

Nutritious and Economical.